THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1933. Vol. XXIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Behind the Ecclesiastical Smoke Screen.

The sixteen-column Supplement of the *Record* (October 18, 1933) is devoted to the defence of the Establishment, which it regards as in imminent danger. The Anglo-Catholic demand for 'spiritual freedom,' 'the inalienable right of the Church to order her own worship,' requires the removal of State control. The Bishop of Durham preaching before the University of Cambridge on October 29th, 1933, has once again insisted on this as absolutely needful. In his peroration he asked :

> 'In such a situation as that which I have attempted to describe, what would appear to be the duty of English Churchmen? In face of the widening breach between Christianity and the modern World, between the spiritual Society and the secular State, what ought to be our aim? I answer with conviction that our immediate duty is to prepare for the crisis which is surely coming upon us, to "clear the decks for action," and to begin, while yet time is given us, by freeing the Church of England from its enfeebling subordination to the State.'

The *Record* points out quite pertinently that the whole subject of the relations of Church and State was investigated by an Archbishops' Committee in 1916, which reported as follows :

> 'The outcome of the historical relations of Church and State in England has been that the State has asserted the right to exercise control over legislation on the affairs of the Church as a condition of the continuance of that ancient connection between Church and State which in these latter days is usually called 'Establishment,' and has exercised that control by making Parliament itself the normal instrument of ecclesiastical legislation. We have shown in this report that this plan has broken down, and we shall now proceed to propose a plan in sub-

stitution for it which, while freeing Parliament from a task for which it is unfitted, will preserve to the State an effective control over the legislation of the Church.'

In introducing in the House of Lords this new measure, which, it was declared by the Church authorities, would provide 'Life and Liberty' for the Church, the Primate said of the Bill, which had secured the support of the bishops, clergy and laity (as represented in the Convocations and Church Assembly) that

> 'there was nothing in the Bill which affected the position of Parliament as the ultimate source of the sanction which must be given to any change affecting the Church of England in regard to its constitution or its relation to the statutory law of the country. In its intention and object the Bill desired to uphold the ultimate control of His Majesty and the Houses of Parliament. *The real question was whether Parliament recognized the Assembly as sufficiently representative. Their desire was to make the assent of Parliament to ecclesiastical legislation not merely formal but a reality.*'

This 'agreed Church measure' duly received Parliamentary and Royal sanction, and yet, so the *Record* predicts, it is the probable intention of the present Archbishops' Commission on Church and State to recommend that Assembly measures should no longer require to be approved by a positive motion in each House of Parliament.

On this proposal to modify the Parliamentary veto, the *Record* comments as follows:

> '*That veto is the lynch-pin of the Reformation Settlement.* Pull it out or (what practically amounts to the same thing) legalize a *recommendation* that Assembly Measures should be deposited with each House and passed automatically should no objection be raised within a stated period, and *what guarantee have we* [in the light of the Prayer Book Measures and the Oxford Movement Centenary] that, in the grip of such *formal* Parliamentary procedure, a change of doctrinal emphasis will not win through and open the floodgates of mediaevalism, robbing us of those blessings of grace, freedom, and progress which our nation and Empire have inherited from the Reformation?'

If the *Record* be correct in its prediction of the intention of the Church authorities in this matter, then it seems to us that the Church will shortly be plunged into a state of perturbation which will do no little injury to the cause of religion in this land, and which will end in the disestablishment, disendowment, and disruption of the Church. Roman Catholicism in England will doubtless be the gainer, as also will secularism, and what Dean Church called the most splendid Church in Christendom will end its career by becoming a congeries of ineffective sects. Establishment, owing to the advances of Anglo-Catholicism and

the consequent desertion of the National Church by vast multitudes of its non-Anglo-Catholic members, is the only effective barrier left between the Church of England and Romanization. It is the recognition of this fact by the Anglo-Catholics, especially since the rejection of the Deposited Book, which is at the back of this growing agitation for the removal of State control. We are assured that the predicted episcopal compromise will not satisfy the Anglo-Catholic party, and it will reduce the confidence of Churchmen generally in the wisdom and loyalty of our episcopal governors.

In this connection we would call attention to an important article contributed to the *Hibbert Journal* of October, 1933, by Professor Hearnshaw on 'Church and State.' After a masterly summary of the successive phases of their relationship, he asks: 'How far is it possible, within the restricted limits of the individual States, and of England in particular, to effect an interim co-operation?' Dr. Hearnshaw asserts that 'in England it ought to be unusually easy,' and that because of the goodwill of the State to the Church as shown by the fact that Parliament has given its ready assent to forty-five measures out of forty-nine submitted to it by the Church Assembly, and, adds the Professor,

> 'if it has rejected four measures . . . it has done so on religious grounds, and for causes that commend themselves to Churchmen who, though they be in a minority in the Assembly, are not improbably a majority in the Church at large.'

He is of opinion that

> 'It would, in short, be a lamentable thing if irritation at the rejection of the Prayer Book measures should lead to a demand for Disestablishment. For a disestablished Church would speedily become disintegrated, and its fragments would inevitably come into violent conflict with one another and with the civil power. Both Church and State would suffer irreparable loss.'

In a disestablished Church, our bishops would not only find themselves shorn of much of their prestige, but also of much of their power. For our Anglo-Catholic brethren are resolved to come to grips at the first opportunity with the growing pretensions of a merely provincial episcopate, and to reduce it to a humiliating sense of its real insignificance in relation to the Catholic episcopate as a whole. It is not in the least likely that in such a crisis Evangelicals and Modernists would do anything to defend an episcopate that had betrayed and ruined the National Church.

Professor Hearnshaw points out to our malcontents a more excellent way. It is the ideal of re-establishment on a broader and better basis.

> 'Not separation but closer association should be the watchword of the future; not disintegration, but a re-union that shall restore on an infinitely broader basis the impressive and powerful solidarity of mediaeval Christendom.'

THE AUSTRALIAN AND SOUTH AFRICAN HERESY CASES.

In this issue we publish an article contributed by an Australian clergyman, formerly a member of Ripon Hall, on the Angus heresy hunt. No final decision has yet been reached in this case, the matter having been referred back to the New South Wales Assembly for judicial proceedings.

The case of Professor du Plessis, which it was hoped had been concluded, has broken out once more owing to the action of the Kerkraad of Stellenbosch, by which the Professor has again been refused access to the local pulpit. This has produced a protest signed by five hundred prominent Afrikander churchmen, many of whom are engaged in important centres of higher and secondary education.

> 'University professors and lecturers, Directors of Education, lecturers of normal colleges, inspectors of schools, principals and teachers of secondary schools, medical practitioners, magistrates, missionaries, attorneys, bank managers, business men, farmers (most of whom are Elders and Deacons of the Church) and others'

are among the signatories. This document has been published in all the South African newspapers. The protesters make no attempt to re-investigate the charge of heresy made against the professor, but condemn with deliberate severity the injustice of the treatment meted out to him. Although they have no hope that their protest will 'lead even to an attempt to right the wrong,' nevertheless they feel bound to put on record for the benefit of future ages their strong condemnation of the action of their ecclesiastical officials. The ninth and concluding paragraph of their protest runs as follows:

> 'Because all true morality is based on right: and when injustice has been done it cannot be wiped out by argument, but only by restoring what is right.'

But apart from the righting of the wrongs of Professor du Plessis, the main reason for the action of the protesters springs from concern for the shattered prestige of their Church and the

effect which the persecution of Professor du Plessis is having on the younger generation of educated South Africans.

It is the future influence of the Christian Church and its moral and spiritual authority outside the narrowing limits of its professed adherents which should be the chief concern of Christian leaders. The ecclesiastical bureaucrat, however, seems to be more concerned with the maintenance of rigidity of organization and uniformity of doctrine than with the problem of how to nourish and stimulate life and promote moral and spiritual influence.

A Lay Apology for Modernism.

No. 54 of *The Informant*, a quarterly organ of the Herts Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union published an admirable *apologia* for Modern Churchmanship by Mr. Arthur Davies, which runs as follows :

> 'I believe in the Modern Churchmen's Movement for three main reasons :
>
> First and chiefly, because in contrast with secularist schools of thought it is "religious." Enlightened self-interest cannot, in my opinion, form a basis for the highest life. The self is obviously limited in purpose and power, and, exalted to a pinnacle of absoluteness, it becomes at once ridiculous and pitiful. It must be related to something bigger, to a universe of selves, to a harmonizing God, whose purpose and favour alone can give any value it may possess to the individual self.
>
> In the second place, while the defence of "religion" in the hands of the traditionalist — whether of the Protestant fundamentalist or of the Catholic type — is so often and so easily obscurantist, the Modern Churchman has the courage to face Truth in all its aspects, and is therefore, so it appears to me, the only champion who can challenge and defeat—or shall we say convert?—the secularist on his own ground.
>
> The third reason for the appeal which the Modern Churchmen's Movement has for me lies in its insistence on toleration. This is its legacy from the old Broad Church School. Conscious that Truth is many-sided, and that each one of us appreciates such fragments of its fullness as our capacity, our tradition, our experience, our knowledge, our character, our individuality permit, the Modern Churchman recognizes that conformity to a rigid and unchanging organization, creed and ceremonial is neither attainable nor desirable.'

Mr. Davies recognizes in a subsequent paragraph of his *apologia* that tolerance towards obscurantism and loyalty to truth are not always easily reconcilable. He notes that

> 'on the one hand lies the danger of a slipshod acquiescence in patent error ; on the other, the danger of tearing up the wheat with the tares.'

Apart from whether tolerance of error and loyalty to truth can be reconciled, we doubt whether they ought to be. Tolerance

should be extended to persons, not to errors, especially when those errors are popular and are proving prejudicial. Where errors are unpopular and insignificant they are no doubt better ignored. Bishop Lightfoot wrote on one occasion of this class of error: 'To criticize and condemn them would be to give them an importance which of themselves they do not possess.' The difficulty is to confute error with absolute justice and charity: to be in our controversies like the 'judicious Hooker,' more intent on showing *why* one's opponent is wrong than that he *is* wrong.

Private Vices, Public Benefits.

Mandeville's *The Fable of the Bees*, the sub-title of which is 'Private Vices, Public Benefits,' has been described as the most immoral book ever written, but that was in the early years of the benighted eighteenth century. The growing exploitation of the gambling spirit in the interests of charity and the general approbation with which this practice is viewed would seem to suggest that Mandeville's volume may become in due season a handbook of public morality.

Meanwhile, we view with satisfaction the efforts of old-fashioned moralists to protest against this popular tendency. Dr. Burroughs, the Bishop of Ripon, with a gratifying wealth of invective, in his recent Presidential Address to his Diocesan Conference (Oct. 24, 1933), has criticized the 'contemptible Scottish counterfeit of the Irish Hospital Sweepstakes.' This Scottish counterfeit, the Bishop declares, 'is the more contemptible both because it is a way of getting round the law and because one has a right to expect of Scotland a higher moral sensitiveness than the religious history of Ireland has put within reach of most of its people.'

There is no doubt at all that the intentions of its originator were admirable. He desired that some of the money which our British gamblers contribute so abundantly to the hospitals of the Irish Free State should be diverted to the support of British hospitals. His scheme, however, has proved a grievous failure, and suggests that many of his assistants are not as financially disinterested as he is himself. The published accounts of the effort indicate that to get rather than to give is the spirit which

has permeated the whole endeavour, and with most disastrous financial results. The total amount obtained by the venture is undisclosed, but after deductions (which appear to include percentages to ticket sellers) it is presented as £152,414. From this is deducted £34,805 for distributors; other expenses, £22,000; prizes to ticket-holders, £36,607; which leaves for the hospitals £59,002. That is to say, the hospitals get some two-fifths of the reduced total.

A Metropolitan Magistrate, in reply to our question as to what in his experience was the chief cause of crime, replied, 'Gambling'; but added, 'You must remember that the people who come into my court are drawn from the lowest classes.'

The recent report on Gambling by a Royal Commission, reviewing a mass of evidence on the growth of gambling, regards it as not only very widely spread over all classes of the population, but as on the increase. Unfortunately the best resources of the Press are at the disposal of the gamblers, the motto of many of our newspaper proprietors apparently being that, while it is their duty to promote the welfare of the public, they must not do it at the cost of a reduction of their own profits.

The Royal Commission condemns the practice of raising money for charities by public lotteries, and asserts that 'in the history of public finance lotteries take their place among the expedients which are resorted to when other and more reputable methods of finance have failed.'

All experienced social workers to-day know that gambling has a disintegrating effect on character and is an important factor in producing poverty and crime. In view of the fact that the Royal Commission, just cited, condemns the practice of raising money for charities by public lotteries, it is high time that our laws should be strengthened against such demoralizing expedients which by checking the flow of charitable support must inevitably end by casting the burden of all our great philanthropic institutions upon the ratepayer.

A Blot on our National Honour.

The tendency to regard our national honour as something entirely subordinate to our national prosperity and to the cause of international peace, is another indication of moral flabbiness

and decline. No doubt muddle-headed pacifism rather than a cowardly materialism is an important factor in this easy descent to moral perdition.

It is for this reason, as well as in the hope that permanent relief and protection may be secured for the Assyrian Christians in Mesopotamia, that we welcome the Bishop of Ripon's indictment of the ineptitude, cruelty and cowardice of our Iraq policy and its terrible results for our unhappy fellow-Christians in those regions. We give in the Bishop's own words his arraignment of British statesmanship in this matter:

> 'So lately as last August another blow fell on the good name and prestige of Great Britain, the full extent of which does not seem to be at all widely realized. I refer to the massacre of Assyrian Christians at Simel and elsewhere in Iraq. Two official bodies to which I belong happen to have had the whole tragic and (for us) humiliating story under detailed review last week; and through more personal channels, on which I can entirely rely though I must not even indicate them, I have had further assurance of the substantial truth of what I am going to say. The story is too long to relate; even the crucial incidents I can only give in barest outline. But I say, with a full sense of responsibility, that one could hardly conceive a situation more calculated to damage this country at the bar of world opinion as a betrayer of its friends. As such we have been held up to scorn in the Press of other nations.
>
> Even if it is open to doubt whether we actually invited the Assyrians, during the war, to rise against the Turks on our behalf; even if it be questioned whether, after undertaking the mandate for Iraq, we actually promised to settle them as a community there, when the Turkish Peace Treaty left to Turkey the Hakkiari Mountains which were their home, and which remain uninhabited to this day: one thing is clear. As the Mandatory Power for Iraq, we used the Assyrian levies to the full as our chief and cheapest means of holding and pacifying the country. We used them to suppress risings among their hereditary enemies, the Kurds, and their prospective overlords, the Arabs. We still use them now to protect our aerodromes on the route to India. All the time they were expecting the fulfilment of what they took to be a promise, to settle them as a tribal unit under their Patriarch as chief; and all the time we put them off. Then with some abruptness, and chiefly to cut down expenses, we shuffled our mandatory responsibilities and pledged our honour to a largely incredulous League of Nations that Iraq was ready for self-government, would take over our obligations to the Assyrians, and would perform all other duties to minorities involved in membership of the League. At the time the young Patriarch, who was educated at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and is even now only 25, protested publicly, foretelling what the result would be. That result came last August, when he (Mar Shimum) had been detained as a virtual prisoner at Baghdad since June, continually pressed by the Iraqi Government to abdicate from his temporal power.
>
> The circumstances which immediately led up to the Simel massacres are obscure and too complicated to unravel here. Be it noted, however, that last Friday (October 20th) the Iraqi representative at Geneva

at last admitted that the Iraqi regular troops had been guilty of "excesses" in suppressing the alleged Assyrian "revolt": thus eating publicly the earlier statements of his Government denying all responsibility. The official story of the "revolt" may therefore also be modified in due course. Be it noted also that, according to last Wednesday's (October 18th) *Times*, the Iraqi commandant responsible for the "operations" against the Assyrians, Bedir Sidky, was on Tuesday last promoted to the rank of General and Pasha, and the value of this apology can be gauged. Then, in the light of these two facts together, judge of the adequacy or otherwise of Sir John Simon's cold statement which followed, blaming the Assyrians almost as much as the Iraqis, and seizing the apology as a good excuse for turning from "the barren procedure of apportioning blame" to the problem of settling the Assyrians outside Iraq.

One would hardly gather, first, that our Foreign Minister was asking the League, in this, to do what we ourselves had left undone; secondly, that the "excesses" now admitted included the mowing down by machine-guns of 315 unarmed males, of from eight years old and upwards, at Simel, and the subsequent execution in batches of some 400 more; thirdly, that, before the massacre, British and American residents in the area had, on one pretext or another, been withdrawn; fourthly, that the victorious Iraqi army, with the Commandant who is now a General, were received after this exploit with delirious rejoicings at Baghdad; and, lastly, that British officials, besides deprecating any sort of enquiry, have, instead of helping, put every obstacle in the way of Mar Shimum in the task of presenting his case to the League, and almost prevented him from getting to Geneva at all. Here, again, one wonders what Mr. Gladstone would have made of such a situation. There is little most of us can do, I suppose, but bear and confess our share in the humiliation of our country, and use our influence to secure that, so far as is still possible, our debt to the Assyrians is discharged. I am not at all convinced that British Christian opinion ought not to go on demanding such an enquiry as the Foreign Office seems to burke. We did undertake responsibility for the good conduct of Iraq, and our guarantee has been called up. It is our honour, even more than that of Iraq, that is at stake.

I have put this tragedy before you as one more shattering proof of the need, even in this country, to reassert the moral factor in politics, and, so far as possible, to breed statesmen, as well as citizens, who will "seek first the Kingdom of God."'

It is manifest that it is the duty of our British representatives to do all in their power to secure a national home for these Assyrian Christians, under the protection of the League of Nations. To allow them to remain subject to Turkish, Kurdish or Arab mis-rule is intolerable. Had Beqir Sidky, the ruthless perpetrator of these recent massacres, been a German, there would have been a general outcry in our newspapers for his execution.

We hope that our readers will support the Bishop of Gloucester's appeal for £1,000 to enable the Assyrian Patriarch, Mar Shimum, to present his case before the League of Nations.

THE CHURCH AND THE AGE

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

VARIOUS influences have contributed at the present time to isolate the Church from the mass of the population and to short-circuit its activities among them. It is not a question only of the cheap motor car, or of popular secularist propaganda. These are not the most potent influences at work. We are faced, rather, with a complete change of outlook on the part of the general public, due to a variety of causes, some of which may be indicated.

(1) The practical secularization of education—more especially the education of the middle class child. The Tudor Grammar Schools, the cultural ideals of which were literary and inherited from the Renaissance, have, since the Education Act of 1902, been replaced by efficient Secondary Schools, whose cultural ideals are primarily scientific and utilitarian.

(2) The widespread and potent influence of a popular press reflecting the mentality of the mass man untouched by traditional culture.

(3) Americanized, semi-negroid amusements, notably the cinema and jazz dancing. Here the entertainment is of a standardized, mechanical character, making a minimum demand upon the intelligence. A highly noxious yet ingenious mixture of sensational stimulus and sedative dope combines in these forms of entertainment to debauch the masses and to lower them mentally and emotionally below the level where the Church can get at them.

(4) In general, the rising up of the sub-man—the vertical invasion of the barbarian from beneath. This gradual debasing of all cultural standards, intellectual, aesthetic and emotional, is a by-product of industrialism with its swollen populations of mechanized humanity.

But perhaps all the foregoing phenomena should be regarded in the light of symptoms rather than causes. They indicate that a new type of culture has come into being to replace the old

traditional type. This new type of culture is (in contrast to the old) 'historyless'—to use Spengler's term. That is to say, it has no traditions behind it, and it compares with the old culture as a toadstool compares with a tree. This fungiform culture is malodorous and poisonous to the human spirit.

The fact is that the type of culture and civilization embodied in the modern industrialized, mechanized world is quite foreign to the type of culture and civilization embodied in the English Church; and, as sometimes happens in the world of nature, the lower organism is ousting the higher. It is as if some noxious parasite had fastened its hold upon some fine tree, or some fatal microbe invaded a healthy man.

The modern world is generally held to have originated with the Renaissance; but it is sometimes forgotten that the Renaissance itself was a two-fold movement and faced, like the god Janus, two ways. It was in part a return to the past, and took the form of a revival of scholarship and of interest in the classic civilization which had perished—or rather, died to be reborn again in European civilization. The type of individual in whom this side of the Renaissance was embodied is exemplified by Erasmus.

But the Renaissance did not consist only of a revived interest in the past; it displayed itself also in a new interest in the present, *i.e.* in the world of nature with which man is surrounded, and also in man's own nature, physical and psychological, which was now to be studied at first hand. Immediate experience was to take the place of traditional theory. The type of person in whom this side of the Renaissance was embodied is exemplified by Leonardo da Vinci—physiologist, engineer and psychologist.

Now it may roughly be said that the English Church is a product of the first side of the Renaissance, while the modern world is the product of the other; for the modern world is the product of science, which sprang from that side of the Renaissance.

Thus the English Church and the modern world are products of two different lines of development, and those two lines have been diverging for a long time. Thus their resultant products are now separated by the widest of gulfs, so that he who would send help from the one to the other cannot. One cannot pass, even if one desires to do so, from Abraham's bosom (the old

culture) to where Dives is tortured by thirst (the modern mechanised, barbarized world). One can shout across the gulf, but no more.

It may seem strange, if not blasphemous, to suggest that the modern world is at one and the same time a product of science and yet in the grip of a fungoid, barbarous culture. Does not science mean civilization? Are not the two terms interchangeable? Unhappily this is not necessarily so, and for more than one reason.

In the first place, although the actual practice of the scientific method, and the processes of scientific research, are mental disciplines of the highest order, as well as stimulants of the creative imagination, an exclusively scientific culture has grave drawbacks, even for those who do original work in science. There is a well-known admission of John Stuart Mill to this effect, and indeed it is generally recognized that to confine oneself, as a scientist, *qua* scientist, must do, to the strictly quantitative aspects of existence, involves grave spiritual sacrifices. Furthermore, the specialization involved has a cramping effect upon the mind.

In the second place, it must be remembered that only a tiny minority of individuals receive the intellectual benefits conferred by the practice of scientific research. The work of the rank and file scientific worker or technician is often of a merely mechanical or routine kind. He has his formula or his foot rule, and applies it. His activities more and more tend to resemble those of the industrial operative who handles a machine.

Yet the rank and file scientific worker does understand the principles of the science in which he works. He derives some mental benefit from his knowledge; he has been disciplined, and up to a point educated, by his training, as well as by the subsequent practice of his skill. But what of the general public? All that science does for the minds of the majority of the population is just to present them with marvels to startle them much in the same way as magic did in the days of old. Ingenious devices and wonder-working or record-breaking machines are all that modern mass man can comprehend of science. Science gives him thrills and physical comforts, while leaving him spiritually starved and intellectually degraded.

Science, furthermore, removes the masses from wholesome contact with nature and her seasonal rhythms, and takes away traditional beliefs, which in essence are true though in form they may be antiquated, and replaces them by no new ones, save a few fantastic superstitions about the ether, about vitamins, microbes, and what not. The truth, not generally realized, is that science can be, and is, a decivilizing agency of unparalleled potency. Modern mass barbarism is a result of applied and popularized science.

It is no wonder that the Church of England, the product of a wholly different tradition, finds itself exiled in an alien world, and stands deserted, like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers.

The situation would be overwhelmingly depressing were it not for one important circumstance; and that is that the modern world, in spite of its glitter, is becoming less and less sure of itself. The optimism and confidence of the last century, which were based on scientific discoveries and their successful application to the increase of wealth and the dropsical growth of population, have vanished. In part this chastened spirit is the fruit of fear — fear of what scientific inventions may bring forth in the way of destructive forces to be utilized in the war which our too efficient technics of production have rendered inevitable. Partly it is due to the devastating revelations of modern psychology, which leave human nature with scarcely a rag to cover its innate bestiality and unreason, and which square ill with the pathetic faith in the innate goodness and loving-kindness of the natural man, upon which all humanistic optimism is based.

Indeed, it is this declining faith in the natural man which is most characteristic of the present reaction from optimism. That faith, which began at the Renaissance, and was fortified by the ravings of Rousseau, is evaporating fast. The many-hued bubble of human perfectibility has been pricked.

Even the clap-trap talked about the distinterestedness of science (a primary article of the nineteenth-century creed) has been exposed. Science is now known to be subservient to commercial and nationalistic interests.

This decline of faith which is now characteristic of those elements of the modern world which are capable of, or have time for, reflection, will eventually spread downwards — if we are

lucky enough to survive long enough for that usually lengthy process to take place. In short, the modern world will turn on its tracks—disillusioned. It may be asking for a different sort of spiritual culture from that on which it has been bred. It may be asking for more religion rather than for more science—of which it has had its bellyful.

This will not of itself be a phenomenon of much cultural value, or of much promise for civilization. Religion is not necessarily a good thing, and whereas science has chastised us with whips, religion may easily chastise us with scorpions. Religion in the past has been both lecherous and sadistic, and may easily be so in the future, especially if the negroid element in our civilization continues to grow as fast as it now appears to be doing. A religious revival, unless it is to be a blight on humanity, requires directing. This is where an institution with cultural traditions like the Church of England comes in.

It is interesting to remember by way of warning that the religious revival which took place in England as a result of the Great War took the form of a revival of two superstitions—of a belief in necromancy and of a belief in the possibility of magical properties being inherent in material objects, whether wafers or mascots. For this perversion of religious faith the Church of England cannot disclaim responsibility. Instead of being ready with a reasonable theology, and a thought-out scheme of spiritual discipline, the Church had been squandering its energies over silly stunts like the National Mission of Repentance and Hope, and even more upon agitations like the Life and Liberty campaign, which proved that when democracy was proven bankrupt elsewhere, the Church was ready to take it up with enthusiasm. It was all a means of escaping from those pressing intellectual problems which it was the real task of the Church to face; and the result was that when the time came, and people were turning to religion, the Church was found wanting. This was due partly to timidity, *i.e.* the fear of tampering with orthodox beliefs, but even more to the fact that the Church did not really believe in its own type of culture, but went a-whoring after that of the commercialized world with which it was surrounded. Post-war ecclesiastics were boosters and live wires rather than men of thought, prayer and principles.

But the post-war reaction was a bagatelle to that which is now on its way, and the question is, Will the Church be any more ready to meet it than was the case in 1918? If not, the religious revival may well flow into most undesirable channels. We see a foretaste of what will happen when we observe the activities of a much-advertised religious movement which at the moment is set upon the conversion of England—or at least of the better-off and more ignorant sections of the middle class. But the Groups are sane and civilized compared to what we shall see when the return to religion really gets going, unguided by any cultural authority such as that which might be embodied in a Church of England which had made a sincere attempt to set its intellectual house in order.

It is fashionable to minimize the importance of the intellectual factor. But without doubt a purge of this sort is very essential for the Church's health and usefulness at the present time. There is much, too much, talk at the moment about efficiency in Church circles. But what we need is not the mechanical efficiency of a business concern, but the spiritual efficiency which only comes from intellectual effort directed with sincerity upon the object of providing a theological vehicle for the religious revival that is upon us. In all probability the revival will take us all by surprise; we shall have no channels into which to direct it; its power will be allowed to run to waste, and we shall be lucky to escape being overwhelmed by a flood of superstitions.

The procedure of putting your intellectual house in order does not consist only in the discarding of untenable beliefs, important and necessary as this may be. Most of the untenable beliefs with which the theology of the Church is at present weighted are peripheral, not central, and the individual with a sense of proportion can usually disregard them—though this, to be sure, is no valid excuse for keeping a cargo of rubbish aboard which brings the water dangerously far above the Plimsol mark. The putting of an intellectual house in order also involves, besides the jettisoning of beliefs which you do not hold, the defining of beliefs which you do hold. A Church without any definite beliefs would not be of much use to anybody in the crisis which we now envisage.

Among such beliefs which call for clear definition, I should rank high, if not highest of all, a disbelief in the natural man, and a belief in his need for redemption by a power higher than himself. The nature of man, the nature of his redemption, and the nature of the power whereby he is to be redeemed, all need careful analysis and definition. It is at this point that the opposition between the new and the old culture, that of the Church and that of the modern world, becomes most acute. Doctrinally, this is the strategic point. The primary need of the Church is not a new formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity or the Incarnation, but a new formulation of the traditional doctrine of Man and of the means of his redemption. In short, we need a new doctrine of Grace. This point was emphasized by one who might have worked it out had he lived—the late Cyril Emmett. Grace involves the dynamic side of religion, and is therefore of primary importance.

It should not be supposed that Modernism consists in making terms with those aspects of modern belief which are in flat opposition to the traditional Christian theory of man. Christian humanism is a doctrine not of human self-sufficiency, nor of the possible redemption of man by science and social reform—useful as such things may be. Christian humanism is a doctrine of man sanctified and strengthened by access to and communion with the divine power revealed in Jesus. It is a doctrine, not of man, but of man *plus* God — even though it may be admitted that 'God' is a term difficult to define, because what is thereby signified lies at the limit of human experience.

The above is only by way of example, and to indicate the nature of the task by which the Church of England is faced. The situation is that the alien culture of the modern world is on the edge of bankruptcy, and there may be a chance of redeeming it by something more civilized, if the Church were a cultural agency of sufficient force and vitality to achieve this.

The trouble, of course, is that whereas that side of the Renaissance culture which gave birth to the modern world went on developing and advancing, assisted by the freedom of inquiry and experiment which prevailed in it, the other side developed less vigorously. It is true that here there may have been less room for development, the plant may have been more mature.

Yet the other side of Renaissance culture—the field of scholarship and of philosophical speculation—was tilled industriously after the Renaissance; but the point is that the tilling was not done under the aegis of the Church. The Church after a while declined to play its proper part in this cultural enterprise, and so deservedly lost the spiritual leadership of Europe. This applied to the Church of England after the eighteenth century quite as much as to the Church of Rome. Doubtless the Church had its excuse; it was inactive because it did not believe in a developing spiritual culture at all.

Yet the consequences of this surrender by the Church of spiritual leadership have been disastrous, and may in the end prove fatal to our civilization. Now that modern scientific culture has become unsure of itself and seems bent on suicide, the Church has no correspondingly developed culture of another kind to offer, since its own spiritual culture has suffered from an arrest. Thus the Church has in fact betrayed those higher aspects of human culture which it existed to foster. It has declined the task of creating a religious culture able to meet the modern world on its own ground, or to provide a faith for that modern world, which has lost its own.

Such a faith will soon be very much in demand, if it is not so already, and it will be humiliating to see the Church fall short of its opportunity. Optimism is a duty; and we must therefore be optimistic, and doubtless the Church, when it realizes the nature of the situation, will take steps to meet it. Steps which, perhaps, will not come too late.

THE RENAISSANCE IN THE BALKAN ORTHODOX CHURCHES

By C. W. D. Grimes, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.R.Hist.S., Officier de l'Instruction Publique, British Chaplain at Barcelona.

IF one wants to learn about the doctrine of the Orthodox Church, there are innumerable books which have been written on the subject. The subject is one which concerns largely the theologian, but in view of the rapprochement which is going on now between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches it may be well worth our while to study the actual working of the Orthodox Church and its difficulties in those countries where it is brought most in touch with Western thought and to see how it reacts to that thought. In that way we may best learn whether an alliance between these two Churches is likely to be fruitful, and if so, how they can help one another. If such an alliance can be fruitful, then the Roman Church, which to-day is as busy trying to convert Orthodox as it is Anglicans, may find that taken together they form, at least in Europe, a stronger force, and one which makes her claim to be the only Church much less striking.

The Orthodox Church in Europe is really a federation of Churches; the Church in each country of the Balkans is autocephalous, even in little Albania, but they all look to the Patriarch of Constantinople as their nominal head. Until the break-up of the Turkish Empire, the Patriarch had temporal as well as spiritual power over all these countries. Now he only rules over some quarter of a million in what remains of Turkey in Europe.

That these Churches are national has its bad points as well as its good ones, for they are thus almost forced to take active part in the quarrels which are constantly breaking out between these countries instead of playing the *rôle* of peacemakers. Thus the Bulgarian Church still is on bad terms with the Greek Church because of the part played by the Greek nation in opposing Bulgarian independence, and there was much opposition to the formation of the independent Church of Albania. To-day there is a growing tendency to national self-consciousness which brings in its train a new interest in the Church, which is apt to be exploited by the leaders of the national parties. There is a danger, too, of these Churches being too apt to rely on patriot-

ism, and even force, to compel reluctant members to do what they want rather than to use methods of persuasion. Merely to stir up priest or gendarme to beat the peasant who is drawn towards the Seventh-day Adventists, or who wants to read his Bible and explain it to others, accomplishes nothing. Again, although they form really a Federation of Churches under the Presidency of the Patriarch of Constantinople, it is impossible to hold a General Council because the Russian Church is now divided into four different parts. That is to say, the Church in Russia is divided into two, and the Church of the *emigrés* is also divided into two, and these parts are all hostile to one another. It would be impossible to call a Council and to exclude the Russian Church, which is the largest of all, and at the same time it seems impossible to agree as to which part shall be summoned, and so the strength which might come to the Church from such mutual action and counsel — such as, for example, the English Church gets at Lambeth — is now denied it.

The Church in the Balkans finds itself to-day in a position of great difficulty where it is almost compelled to fight for its very existence. It is passing through a very painful transitory period : it is still living partly in the atmosphere of the eighteenth century Turkish Empire, and partly is confronted by the most up-to-date currents of thought. This applies to all these countries, though to some more than others. Thus there are parts of Macedonia where there are old, illiterate priests who know the service by heart and cannot even sign their own names. At the same time, the Roumania Synod passed several years ago a law forbidding the ordination of anyone who had not a university degree. This peculiar mixture of customs and institutions belonging to two different epochs can be observed in all expressions of Church life in the Balkans and constitutes a great difficulty towards its normal development. Hand in hand with this goes the deplorable consequences on the life of the people of the Turkish yoke, which lasted for three or four centuries and is responsible for their backward condition.

The greatest danger that the Church has to face is Communism. But the Communist, with his anti-God campaign, is naturally strongest in the Balkans, which have so many connections with Russia, whose enthusiastic youth are making an enormous propaganda in these regions, and with such success that the

Orthodox are fast finding their churches empty of youth. Whereas in the past they could always count on tradition and patriotism to retain them within the Church, now they find they must adopt other measures.

Then there is the action of the Roman Church. Already there are a very considerable number of Roman Catholics in these countries; in Yugoslavia thirty-nine per cent. of the population is Roman Catholic, and in Albania eleven per cent., and there are a considerable number in Roumania and Bulgaria. The Romans are, moreover, very busy making converts, sometimes directly and sometimes by means of the Uniat Church. They have a large body of priests, trained in the Oriental School of Studies in Rome, who adopt the language, dress and, in a large measure, the customs of the Eastern Church and in this way seek to get hold of the people. The Orthodox naturally feel very bitter about this. And all the world knows of the recent Papal intrigue to have the heir to the Crown of Bulgaria brought up a member of the Roman Catholic Church in spite of the Constitution of that country. There is, however, one monastery in Belgium whose monks, with no great support from those in authority, seek to understand better the position of the Orthodox and to work for a reconciliation.

If Russia with its Bolshevism and Italy with its Romanism constitute difficulties of a very different kind for the Orthodox, England, France and America, the typical Western countries, constitute difficulties almost as great. France has been especially responsible for that Western Liberal philosophy which has done much to disintegrate and revolutionize their ways of thinking and which has brought about a great increase in scepticism, while England and America have been responsible for the many Protestant organizations which have started work in these countries, and which have seemed to the Orthdox to be busily engaged in proselytizing, either directly or indirectly. Such are the Methodist and Baptist Churches (supported largely by outside grants), the 7th-day Adventists, the Plymouth Brethren, the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Student Christian Movement, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the American colleges in Turkey, Greece and Bulgaria.

The attitude of the Orthodox Church towards the Bible is different from that of either the Roman Church or the English

Church. It permits its people to read the Bible, but only allows the priest to expound it; while its attitude is sufficiently obscurantist to insist that in the services of the Church the Bible shall only be read, as indeed the rest of the service is, in an archaic—in Greece in Old Greek, and in the other countries in Old Slavonic—that is to say, in a language not understood by the great mass of the people. It has also been exceedingly slow in putting out versions in the vernacular. A friend writes that in the thirty years he has been there he has only known the Roumanian Church put out one version of some 10,000 Bibles, while in the meantime the British and Foreign Bible Society has put out version after version running into tens of thousands every year. In Bulgaria the Synod has just put out a version of its own, and one of its adherents, at his own expense, has issued a version in the language of the Gypsies.

The report of the Bible Society shows, however, that their agents meet with much opposition from the priests in selling their Bibles, and that the priests often call in the aid of the local authorities—who are not, however, always on their side. One extremely parochially-minded priest compelled the people in his village to give up the Bibles which they had bought and had them taken to a neighbouring village, where he seemed indifferent to their fate. Another old man in Roumania was taken before the court for reading the Bible. 'All my life,' he said, 'I have lived in wickedness, and for this you never did anything to me; but now in my old age when I am doing good, you punish me, but I am glad to suffer for the Gospel.' We read also of the agent of the Bible Society who, brought before a Turkish Judge, made such an impression on the Judge that he dismissed the case and invited the agent to dine with him. It is only fair to say that there is another side to the case, and that some priests were anxious to buy Bibles for themselves and congratulated the colporteur on the work he was doing. The Archbishop of Athens took the agent with him to his theological college and invited all the students to buy a copy of the Bible in modern Greek, though he admitted in conversation that many of his leading ecclesiastics were opposed to this modern version.

In the past there has been little preaching in the churches; many of the priests were too ignorant to be capable of it, and in the village churches there has been no preaching at all. A friend

of mine who lived some years ago for two years in a village and regularly attended the church, never heard during that time a sermon. But the bishops, aware that, with no Sunday schools and with no preaching, they could not hope to retain the youth, especially as the Communists and the Protestants were making so much counter-propaganda, have now done their best to re-introduce preaching. The Archbishop of Athens has given a course on it in the Faculty of Theology at the University there, and the Archbishop of Bulgaria has set a fine example in his own person. To encourage preaching it has been necessary to raise the standard of the education of the clergy. In the past it was often sufficient for the village priest to have had a village school education and to have gone to a seminary. Now, as we have seen, in Roumania a university degree is necessary; in the towns in Greece and in Bulgaria an effort has been made to reach the same standard, and everywhere a secondary school education is required. Nevertheless, as one who has lived long in Roumania remarks, the training of the clergy is the most important thing for the deepening and strengthening of Christian influence among the Balkan peoples, and until many of the seminaries are staffed by very much better men than at present, it is hopeless to look for much improvement. Nor is it easy, as experience has already shown, to substitute a better order for the lax discipline that has often prevailed in the past among students unaccustomed to discipline. In one case it was the reforming Principal who was dismissed, and not the lax students.

Among the bishops themselves, it was said, that some thirty years ago it was rare indeed to find one with a university degree. Now, nearly all the bishops are men who have not only studied at home, but have continued their studies abroad in Germany, Switzerland, France and England, and have attended both Protestant and Catholic faculties in those countries with the object of getting breadth of view. In London, St. Basil's House has been started by the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius with the object of making it more possible for ordinands of small means to come to England and to live there in a community. Of English clergymen they are rather afraid, regarding them as only too often emissaries of the British Empire. The bishops are all selected from the monastic orders, and that unfortunately creates a gap between them and the parochial clergy which it is

not easy to bridge. Every man before he is ordained must decide whether he wishes to belong to the regular or the secular clergy; if the latter, he must be married before ordination, and he must marry the daughter of a priest. In order to fit these girls for their future vocation there are large schools especially for them. No second marriage, however, is allowed to a priest.

Monasticism still survives in the Orthodox Church, and there are some twenty monasteries on the peninsula of Mount Athos alone belonging to various nationalities. These monasteries go back in many cases to the eleventh century. Monasticism, however, is in a state of decay, though recently, owing to the influx of Russian nuns and monks, an attempt has been made to revive it. The Orthodox monastic orders, unlike their counterparts in the West, do not take part in educational or social work, but give themselves up to a life of devotion and to the religious mysticism which is inherent in the Slav temperament.

One more word about the parish priest. According to rule he must pay regular visits to the homes of his parishioners, but only a few really zealous priests do so. In most cases they only enter the houses of their parishioners when called in for the administration of the Sacraments and for the visitation of the sick. There are also in most of the Balkan countries customs of having family festivals, which begin by a special service held in the home by the priest. An ordinary village priest holds services only on Sunday mornings, or on important Church festivals which do not fall on a Sunday. Parochial visits, though infrequent, are laborious owing to the long distances and the bad roads. There is great poverty to-day, especially in the villages. As a consequence, in order to secure for the priest a living wage, parishes are being joined together, and in other cases the priest becomes the village schoolmaster or follows some other occupation.

The great problem of the Church is how to retain the youth, and quite recently important conferences have been called together, showing that the Church is alive to this necessity. Conferences have been held, for example, at Sofia in 1928, at Athens in 1930, and at Bucharest in 1933, between representatives of the Orthodox Church on the one hand, and representatives of the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., and the Student Christian Movement on the other, to arrange for the common ground on which these

organizations can co-operate with the Church without being guilty of proselytizing. A Pan-Hellenic Conference of Orthodox Teachers has been held recently which urged the founding of catechetical schools with a systematic course of instruction, the inauguration of a Union of Mothers, and the appointing of the day on which Jesus became 'a Son of the Law' as a Festival of Youth.

In 1930 a Pan-Orthodox Conference was held, organized by the Commission of Youth of the Oecumenical Council of Practical Christianity. In the interesting discussions that followed many points of value were brought out. The Church, it was said, had isolated itself from culture, and as a consequence was no longer regarded as a potential source of culture. The Orthodox kept their religion and their culture in separate compartments, mysticism, asceticism and ritualism being entirely divorced from their ordinary life. The clergy, owing to their lack of education, found themselves too often in an inferior position to those whom they should teach. The religious ardour with which the young Slav attached himself to new and revolutionary propaganda shows that he is not indifferent to religious and moral ideals when presented by modern thinkers in a modern way. To-day, however, as we have stressed, orthodox youth is outside the Church, which it considers is not meriting serious attention. The Church appears to him to be merely a support of a social order instituted by tyrants. Religious questions they describe facetiously as 'questions of popes.'

The art of music has made great advances in modern Greece, but well-organized orchestras and well-trained choruses are mainly used to minister to depraved popular tastes. The Orthodox Church might do much to consecrate the noblest music to moral and spiritual ends. This it fails to do. The technical rendering of music in the churches is usually of a very low order, and causes not only displeasure but even disgust. In villages it is not infrequent for an illiterate and unkempt man to undertake to sing, without an instrumental accompaniment and without a choir, and with little melody and no rhythm. Such culpable negligence has contributed to the growing desertion of the churches. In Saloniké on a Sunday it would be hard to find even fifty gymnasium students among the congregations. Yet the Greek nation has strong Christian convictions, as it has

shown by the tenacity with which it held to the Christian Faith during centuries of Turkish oppression. Nevertheless, Bolshevik propaganda on the one hand, and ecclesiastical obscurantism and inertia on the other, threaten to-day the ruin of that Church which infidel oppression failed to overthrow.

In Roumania there is a strong reaction against the worship of Western civilization, and especially of French literature and philosophy, with its indifference or even hostility to the Orthodox Church. A return to the faith of their fathers, a closer union with the peasants, a liberation from Western forms of thought—these are the main tendencies of modern cultured Roumanians. These ideals have been incorporated in the programme of the 'Iron Guard' led by Professor Krainik, the well-known poet and theologian of modern Roumania. The party consists chiefly of students, but it is growing among the peasants and has much sympathy among many who do not care actually to join it.

There is a Student Home Mission Society with some 250 members, chiefly theological students, started by Professor Isper, a graduate of Oxford, who, under his leadership, conduct Sunday schools, visit prisoners, and work among artisans and peasants. Another Student Christian Society which has now existed for some time, and some of whose older members occupy important public positions, by means of lectures and literary work has created a profound religious influence in the life of the Orthodox Church. The Theological Faculty of Bukarest University, with its 1,100 men and 250 women students, is probably the largest in the world. There are, besides this, two other theological faculties, eight academies and five seminaries which train students for ordination. With such a wealth of material to choose from, the Synod can well insist on a degree before ordination. Dr. Fernov remarks

> 'that the problems discussed by these Roumanian students, and the books they read and the articles they produce, are on such a high level that no other Student Movement can compete with them.'

The movement tends, therefore, to gather round it youth who are far ahead of the average Roumanian priest. Natually they make enemies, but they have some real and faithful friends among the most outstanding of the bishops, clergy and monks.

In Greece there is a Society called *Zoe*, which is directed by eight priests and some twenty-seven laymen, who remain unmarried while they are members of it. They give themselves up

to literary and missionary work and produce some of the finest preachers in the country. Through their printing press they are very active in producing literature, so much so that one has heard the boast that there is more religious literature per head in Athens than in London. They have their own paper, and a library and a chapel, and 102 *cours de catechism.* In 1914 a priest called Mare Tsak Fani began to gather in his church first young girls and then young boys in order to teach them. He then started a paper called the *New Birth*, and soon, with the aid of the Archbishop of Athens, ever forward in good works, his movement grew rapidly. These young people then took up home missionary work and began to go and speak in the halls of the public schools, with the permission of the Minister of Education, and in other places, and to convert their fellows. They then extended their work to the factories, where they have many 'cells,' and in each quarter of Athens they have set up associations. They also, in connection with *Zoe*, run night schools and do charitable work. Their success depends not only on their enthusiasm, but also on the fact that there are so many young people who are religious but anti-clerical. In every large town in Greece there are to be found branches of the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A., which function here far more successfully than elsewhere.

In Belgravia as far back as 1892 a Society called *Anue* was started with the object of getting hold of youth. Later it joined with the Y.M.C.A., and in 1924 with the Y.W.C.A. and the Student Christian Movement. There have been many misunderstandings owing to the fear of the Orthodox that their children were being proselytized, and there have been internal disputes and breakaways; but to-day this Society numbers some 5,000 members. In Yugoslavia there seems at present to be little work in connection with social problems, but perhaps the meeting there this year of the World's Alliance for Friendship through the Churches may stimulate the Church to greater activity.

It is clear that there is a renaissance going on in the Orthodox Church, and we may well hope that these genuinely religious people will achieve their task of making their Church a home of really Christian culture; but to accomplish this they need all the brotherly help and co-operation that the other Christian nations can give them.

HAS MODERNISM A GOSPEL?

By the Editor.

IT is necessary to begin with some definition of terms. What is Modernism in religion? From many definitions I select two. (1) Professor Percy Gardner thus defines it:

> 'Modernism is based upon evolution in science and the critical method in history: and it demands, not that the great truths of the Christian religion shall be given up, but that they shall be considered afresh in the light of growing knowledge, and re-stated in a way suitable to the intellectual conditions of the age.'

(2) Mrs. Humphry Ward, the novelist, thus described its aim:

> 'Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity, *not outside, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches,* to secure not a reduced, but a transformed Christianity.'

The opposite of Modernism is not Catholicism nor Protestantism. The Modernist accepts what he believes to be the essentials of both Catholicism and Protestantism. With the Catholic, he believes in one holy, catholic and apostolic Church, and, with Archbishop William Temple, regrets that it does not exist.

Nevertheless the Modernist regards this one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church as an absolute necessity if the human race is to be won to the Christian religion and is to remain Christian. With the Protestant, he believes in the right of private judgment and the need for stimulating its activities and protecting its freedom as an essential factor in a dynamic and progressive Christianity. For private judgment is the growing point of the Church. But at the same time he holds that man to be a fool who relies solely on his own private judgment and does not strive at all times to learn and weigh the judgments of all authorities past and present, holding with John Henry Newman, though not with John Henry Newman's limitations:

> 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum.'

Whilst, then, the Modernist does believe in one holy, catholic and apostolic Church, he believes also that there is something greater than it — namely, the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of Freedom, Truth and Love; and moreover that, without being filled to the full with that Spirit, the Church cannot become one, holy, catholic and apostolic.

The true opposite of Modernist is Traditionalist. George Tyrrell used the term Mediaevalist as the opposite of Modernist, but the term Traditionalist is better, because Modernism and its opposite existed in the Christian religion long before Mediaevalism, and Mediaevalism is itself but a phase of Traditionalism.

The word Gospel must mean for us Glad Tidings—the Divine message which came through Christ. When it be asked whether Modernism has such a Gospel, we shall do well before attempting to answer that question to observe some features of the Gospels which Traditionalism has proclaimed to mankind in the name of Christ.

Even in the Apostolic age the good news had a lurid, terrifying quality. It was united to the prediction of an appalling catastrophe about to crash upon the world — a catastrophe which would involve in irremediable ruin the vast majority of the human race, but would secure deliverance for that small proportion of it which accepted the Christian Faith as proclaimed by its early missionaries. This 'good news' of the Traditionalist Gospel has never seemed good news except to the few who accepted it.

I may not consider here the vexed question whether this was the good news of the Kingdom proclaimed by Jesus Himself. For myself I do not believe it was. His Gospel was essentially moral and mystical, and no more apocalyptist than it was nationalist. Nevertheless the Christian Gospel of the early ages was dominantly apocalyptic, and terror and horror played no small part in that Gospel.

In the Traditionalist Gospel, while the imminent crash of the last judgment is postponed from age to age, the ever-present horror of hell remains. 'And the smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever.' It was the possession of the key of that horror by the Mediaeval Church which was the secret of its power over its members. Dr. Percy Dearmer's *Legend of Hell* shows how that power was wielded and with what effects.

Modernism in the persons of F. D. Maurice, Dean Farrar, Archdeacon R. H. Charles and many lesser-known men has eliminated the terror of the *Parousia* and the horror of everlasting torment from the Christian religion. It was the judgment of the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Judicial Privy Council

in the *Essays and Reviews* case which dismissed hell with costs —but the costs were paid in some measure by the Modernists, who subsequently strove in their respective religious communities to make that Privy Council judgment effective.

Another aspect of the Traditionalist Gospel, no less horrible but more mysterious, was the dogma of predestination. Double predestination linked to the doctrines of original sin and the universal depravity of the human race. This combination of horrors and of inscrutable mysteries, for which it is the fashion now to blame John Calvin and his successors, forgetting that all and more than all of this horror of Calvinist theology is promulgated in the writing of Augustine of Hippo, presented the good news of God as the most terrifying and inscrutable of inevitable certainties and added amazingly to the misery of the Christian world, save in the case of those self-complacent subjects of Divine election like Holy Willy, whose gospel—that is, the gospel of Augustinian and Calvinist Christianity—is so adequately summarized by Robert Burns in the opening lines of *Holy Willy's Prayer*:

> 'O Thou wha in the Heavens dost dwell,
> Who as it pleases best Thysel
> Sends ane to Heaven and ten to Hell
> A' for Thy glory,
> And not for any gude or ill
> The've done afor Thee.'

This aspect of the Traditionalist Gospel, though it lingers with us in the Westminster Confession of the Scottish Church and the unrevised Baptismal Service of the 1662 Church of England Prayer Book, has become an ineffective ghost, thanks to the Modernism which dissipated the doctrine of the Fall by demonstrating that Adam and Eve and the apple and serpent were not historic reality but primaeval legend.

I turn to another aspect of the Traditionalist good news of God—the salvation vouchsafed to mankind through Christ. This salvation the Traditionalist Gospel secured only for a very limited number. But how was it secured, and what was it when possessed? A study of the Traditionalist doctrines of the Atonement as presented, for instance, in Rashdall's *Idea of the Atonement*, is an amazing history. But its essence may be summed up in the words of the Second Article of the Thirty-nine:

'who [Jesus Christ] truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to

reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.'

We have every sympathy with the difficulties with which Christian theologians were faced who strove to construct doctrines of the Atonement, but what immoral muddles we see them to be. The angry God, the fallen race, the atoning blood of the expiatory sacrifice, its perpetual repetition in the celebration of the Mass—how incredible in their presentation of the Divine nature and the atoning work of Jesus they are. Yet these expositions constitute in varying degrees aspects of that good news of God which for the modern mind render this Traditionalist Gospel repellent and incredible. Salvation for sinners was secured by the propitiatory sacrifice of the sinless Son of God. Sinners appropriated to themselves the redeeming effect of this sacrifice by an act of faith which professed absolute belief in the complete efficacy of that expiatory sacrifice, and when faced with poignant memories of sin, pleaded before the Throne of Grace the merits of their blood-bought redemption. One even of our most beautiful modern Communion hymns contains these lines:

'Look, Father, look on His anointed face,
And only look on us as found in Him;
Look not on our misusing of Thy Grace,
Our prayer so feeble and our faith so dim;
For lo, between our sins and their reward
We set the passion of Thy Son our Lord.'

Closely connected with these amazing doctrines of the Traditionalist Gospel are its sacramentalist theories and practices. Salvation has been exclusively limited in the Catholic Church to those who have been the blessed recipients of its sacramental rites. The Catholic doctrine of salvation given and guaranteed by the worthy reception of Sacraments was an infinitely more comforting doctrine than the gloomy horrors of salvation by an inscrutable divine election; but how terrible was the outlook for the innumerable millions for whom sacramental salvation was impossible even though heroic Jesuit missionaries strove to bring the Sacrament to all mankind.

When we ask, therefore, 'Has Modernism a Gospel?' we do well to have recalled what kind of Gospel, at least in its crudest and most popular forms, Traditionalism has offered to mankind.

This Traditionalist Gospel in its crudest forms received for many its *coup de grace* when the English popular press started

the slogan, 'Why does not God stop the War?' and plain men echoed 'Why not?' for the Christian religion has taught us that God is omniscient and omnipotent. He has foreseen all this horror with its ten million dead, and He can do all things, so had He wished he could have prevented this war. Either the omnipotent God of the Traditionalist Gospel does not exist, and the view that if He willed He could at any time intervene irruptively to correct and amend the evils of the creative process is baseless, or else He could have intervened but did not choose to do so, and so cannot be rightly called the God whose nature and whose name is Love. As a consequence, the omnipotent, miracle-working God of the Traditionalist Gospel was no longer believed in, and vast masses of Christians abandoned a superstitious Christianity for a practical secularism. Since then all the more enterprising and courageous clergy in England, whether members of the Free Churches or of the Established Church, have become increasingly Modernist. Their Modernist Gospel may be half-baked, but it is providing some moral and spiritual nutriment for those who would otherwise have none.

The Gospel of the Modernist is based on the conviction that the creative process, in the midst of which he finds himself, is essentially rational, moral and spiritual. If he be asked what is the justification for that view — can the Modernist find it in science? can he find it in human history? can he find it in the Bible?—he will reply: Yes, he finds it in part in all these, but he finds it most of all in himself, the evolving constitution of human nature. That is the essence of the Modernist Gospel. As human nature evolves it is becoming increasingly rational, moral and spiritual. This human nature the Modernist regards as Divine. When *Genesis* proclaims that God created man in His own image, it is proclaiming the core of the Modernist Gospel. It is the acceptance of this protoevangelium which makes it possible for the Modernist to believe in the Incarnation.

For the Modernist, the Incarnation is not a single isolated miraculous event in the long succession of human history, but a process, the most significant process in the whole course of creation. That view is briefly yet adequately presented thus by Professor Pringle Pattison:

> 'We are far too apt to limit and mechanize the great doctrine of the Incarnation, which forms the centre of the Christian faith. Whatever

> else it may mean, it means at least this—that in the conditions of the highest human life we have access, as nowhere else, to the inmost nature of the Divine. "God manifest in the flesh" is a more profound philosophical truth than the loftiest flight of speculation that outsoars all predicates and, for the greater glory of God, declares Him unknowable.'

The Modernist view of the Incarnation, which beholds the supreme unveiling of the Divine Nature under strictly human limitations in Jesus Christ, regards that divine unveiling as differing in degree, not in kind, from many preceding divine revelations made in the course of human history. Moreover, if it be asked whether Modernism regards that divine revelation as final, the Modernist will answer 'No.' That divine revelation is carried forward in human history by the operation of the Divine Spirit so wonderfully manifest in Jesus, but that Divine revelation conflicts in no way with the revelation given in and through Jesus, but is a development and expansion of it. The Fourth Gospel may not be reciting the actual words of Jesus, but it is proclaiming the growing experience of the Christian consciousness when it makes Jesus say:

> 'I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now, but when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He shall guide you into all Truth.' 'All that the Father hath is mine, therefore He (the Spirit) shall take of mine and shall show it unto you.'—*John* xvi, 13-16.

It is a single divine revelation coming from the Divine Father, carried on by the operation of the Divine Spirit supremely manifest at one point of human history, Jesus Christ. This process of Incarnation is not only a process of divine revelation, it is in another of its aspects a process of divine atonement—the bringing together into sinless communion of man with God. This is the core of the Modernist Gospel, that the whole creative process is in its highest aspect a process of Divine Incarnation, Divine Revelation and Divine Atonement.

These three, though distinguishable in thought, are practically inseparable in action. There are no divine irruptions, no miraculous interventions, no propitiatory sacrifices, no universal human depravity, no defeat of the divine purpose, but the working out of a divine creative will with which in its higher stages man may co-operate. This conception of the aim of the creative process justifies it at the bar of the rational and moral consciousness. We cannot say that that process, so far as we know it, up

to the present point is rationally and morally justifiable. We can only say that from what we have observed of the trend of that process it seems as though it would be ultimately justifiable at the bar of reason and conscience, and it is only by what it is then that it can be held to be justified. The saying of Aristotle that the true nature of a thing is that which it is when its becoming is completed must be supremely true in the case of the creative process itself. That is the Modernist's faith and that is the Modernist's Gospel. Dean Inge has said :

> 'No Christian philosophy can have any value which does not bring the Incarnation into closest relation with the cosmic process.'

This is equally true of Divine Revelation and of Divine Atonement. And it seems to me that the Modernist Gospel does do this. But if the manger at Bethlehem does not lose its significance in the Modernist Gospel, does not the Cross of Calvary do so? Is there any place for the Cross in the Modernist Gospel? Is the Cross still crucial? John Bunyan writes of his hero :

> 'I saw in my dream his burden loosed from off his shoulders and fall from off his back, and began to tumble, and so continued to do, till it came to the mouth of the sepulchre, where it fell in, and I saw it no more.'

And the pilgrim sings with exultation :

> 'Blest cross ! blest sepulchre ! Blest rather be
> The Man that there was put to shame for me ! '

What is the symbol of the Cross for the Modernist? Does he see inscribed on it in golden letters 'God is Love'? Does he see written underneath it 'He made Him to be sin for us Who knew no sin'? Can the Modernist exult in the words of the Unitarian hymn :

> the Cross of Christ I glory ;
> Towering o'er the wrecks of time,
> All the wealth of sacred story
> Gathers round its head sublime.'

The Modernist's answer has in all sincerity to be 'Yes' and 'No.' Everything depends upon what is meant by 'the Cross of Christ.' The Cross for the Modernist is the symbol of that moral and spiritual religion which Jesus Christ died to proclaim to mankind. 'To take up the Cross' means for the Modernist the obligation to carry forward that work of Christ, even at the cost of much, or even all, that the natural man values and cherishes. The Cross is the enemy of materialism and superstí-

tion, of legalism and obscurantism, of nationalism and sectarianism in religion. Thus the Cross is the spear-head of moral and spiritual progress, and its motto is 'Forward.' The slogan of the Modernist is not simply 'Back to Jesus,' but 'Forward with the Spirit of Christ.' The Cross symbolizes moral and spiritual values gained for mankind at the cost of voluntary self-sacrifice. It is thus the symbol of vicarious suffering for mankind. This is a law of human progress: it is an essential factor in the creative process: and we have no doubt reflects an aspect of the Divine Father Who suffers in proportion as He loves.

For the Modernist the Cross does not mean expiatory sacrifice. It affords no foundation for pleading Christ's merits as the only secure way of removing human guilt. Jesus did not present His crucifixion in that way. Such a Gospel of the Atonement is sub-Christian. Forgiveness of our sins is not secured by pleading the merits of Christ's Passion, but by our forgiving others, by our repenting deeply, by our loving much. The Gospel of the Atonement is found in the Lord's Prayer, the parables of the Prodigal Son and of the Pharisee and the Publican, and in the story of the sinful woman who loved much. God can only forgive those who are forgiveable, and Christ is our Redeemer because, and in so far as, He renders us forgiveable.

The Modernist must claim in the light of Church history that the Gospel of Modernism has much greater claims to be regarded as a gospel than the Gospel of Traditionalism. In the Modernist Gospel, God is no less the Divine Father, Jesus the Divine Saviour, the Holy Spirit the Divine Illuminator and Sanctifier. For the Modernist, God is Love, Light and Truth. He is that spirit whom men must worship in spirit and in truth. The Holy Spirit, the Divine Presence with men, is ever ready to guide them into all truth as they yield to His influence.

With Modernism, the lost radiance of the primitive Gospel shines forth once more. It may seem too good to be true, for it has to be lived to be believed. At this stage it is a venture of faith, not a certainty. As a friend of mine said, 'My conviction is that the Last Trump is the King of Hearts.'

THE AUSTRALIAN HERESY TRIAL

By Kenneth Henderson, M.A., B.Litt. (Oxon.).

IN the latter part of last century the uprush of the spirit of scientific criticism within historic Christianity dramatized itself in several heresy trials which brought home vividly to the man in the street the disturbing and quickening currents that were transforming the world of religious scholarship. Naturally men and women whose spiritual treasure was enshrined in the earthen vessels of traditional formulations were deeply troubled at what seemed to them a work of destruction. But fortunately the men whose outspoken passion for truth brought them into the forefront of the battle were not merely scholars but men of devout, saintly and attractive personality whose scholarship, while it made obsolete much that was contained in traditional formulae, released what their disciples thankfully accepted as simpler and more reasonable forms of Christian belief. They were men in whom faith and honesty shone clearly. The most important achievement of the New Learning — the close and critical study of the Gospels and the life of Jesus Himself — while it produced results startling to many of the faithful, brought to still more an extraordinarily fresh and renovating sense of intimacy and understanding. It seemed to restore Christ's sense of proportion. Bishop Colenso the Anglican, and Robertson Smith the Presbyterian, stood their trials for their work on the Old Testament and were condemned (Colenso was acquitted on appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council); but they made their points, and later scholars, such as Sanday, Driver and Gore at Oxford, and George Adam Smith in Scotland, were able to carry on their work without expulsion from the Christian ministry. The characters of these pioneers were such as to make nonsense of the charge that their work was destructive to the power of the Christian message. Of their company is Dr. Angus, the distinguished Professor of New Testament and Historical Theology at St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney.

Against this background of seventy years of hard fighting, with honesty and devotion on both sides, we must envisage the trial of Professor Angus before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Melbourne. Organized Christianity in Australia, perhaps, on the balance, to its own loss, has not hitherto known any first-class trials for heresy. He has been acquitted by the New South Wales Assembly, who found that there were no grounds for a trial; but his accusers appealed to the higher court, which has referred back the matter to the N.S.W. Assembly for judicial proceedings.

The Counter-attack.

In his address before the N.S.W. General Assembly on May 18th, now published in pamphlet form,[1] Professor Angus accuses his assailants of having lost a sense of spiritual proportion:

> 'The world has struck its tents and is on the march, but we professed leaders are showing ourselves more expert in transmitting correct traditions than in discerning the signs of the times. We are making theories of Jesus' person more important than the personal loyalty and spirit of sacrifice which Jesus considered distinctive of His followers. We seem to act on the assumption that the Church can be pushed back into 1901 or 1647 and kept there by legislation and votes. Is it not possible that the Church has made some advances of thought since 1647, and perhaps seen more of the love of God and the purposes of God since the Westminster Divines codified their religious opinions between 1643 and 1649? Is religious life which creates theologies not also the great iconoclast of theologies?'

Dr. Angus affirms that the 'sons of thunder,' who have accused him, charge his teachings, not with inconsistency or disloyalty to the teaching and spirit of Jesus, but with inconsistency to the subordinate standards of 1647 or with inconsistency to their own interpretation of those standards. But, he says, Christ cannot abdicate His unassailable spiritual supremacy to exercise a legislative sway under the charter of this subordinate standard. 'The world wishes to see Jesus, and we have offered it Christology or disputes about Christology. . . . The world has been informed that our primary concern is to deal with religious theories of the past, and make these normative for the present and for all time.'

[1] *Christianity and Dogma: Professor Angus and his Critics.* Address delivered before the N.S.W. General Assembly, Sydney, 18th May, 1933. (Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1/-; and also the Australian Book Company, 16 Farringdon Avenue, E.C.4.)

The Sense of Proportion.

In the Melbourne debates Dr. Angus and his supporters, who included the Victorian Moderator and the Master of Ormond College, University of Melbourne, were accused of having no subordinate standards — that is, of not acknowledging the binding authority of any official formulation of the Church's belief. When the more formal enquiries, now to be taken, are begun, that will prove the crux of the matter. The historic formularies of all our great religious bodies took shape in the century of controversy between the middle of the sixteenth and the middle of the seventeenth centuries. Can these historic bodies impose these definitions with binding force on their ministries in the light of the renaissance of religious thought and scholarship during the past seventy years? The literal application of the Thirty-nine Articles in the sense that they were written would eliminate almost the entire ministry of the Church of England. But the Parliament, in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission in 1865, amended the form of subscription so as to admit the largest freedom in the interpretation of the doctrinal formularies of the Church of England and so secured intellectual freedom for the English clergy. Similarly it is urged, concerning those opponents of Professor Angus who are scholars and think he has gone too far, that if the Westminster Confession were pressed home against them, they would also be condemned. Dr. Angus thus states his attitude to doctrinal formulae:

> 'The world recognizes the fruits of Christian life under the most diverse theological systems, but we seem to have asserted the principle of uniformity of doctrine which makes all inquiry impossible. The interests which were of supreme moment to Jesus were righteousness, truth, kindness, love, service and imitation of God; Jesus had nothing to say of virgin births and trinities, unitarianism and propitiation, . . . the fallen nature of man, and his own Deity; and yet these are the things which this controversy has offered as surrogates for the eternal values of Jesus and His captivating simplicities.
>
> . . . We are making the fatal error of identifying religion with theology, and faith with beliefs or subscriptions to articles. We cannot make any dogmatics of the past our lode-star for our future. We dare not treat truth as something we can imprison in formularies to which we sign our names and insist on others doing likewise. Truth is rather something that holds us, that comes possessingly upon us with its imperativeness.
>
> . . . This religious warfare tends to give a distorted view of Christianity. Our faith did not take its rise in a graveyard outside Jerusalem,

but in the divine personality of the Prince of Life. Christianity consists not of creeds, but of deeds and thinking the thoughts of God. It is vision and courage rather than doctrinal sediment. Christianity has God, and God only, at its centre. The true task of Christianity is to make men God-like and centres of creative goodness. Christianity is fellowship with the Father and the Son rather than a concensus of opinions. "True Christianity," says Edward Caird, "is not something which was published in Palestine and which has been handed down by a dead tradition ever since; it is a living and growing spirit that learns the lesson of history and is ever manifesting new powers and leading on to new truths."

Faith is not linked chiefly or only with verifiable facts of history, still less with shifting opinions. It is the pursuit of ideals; it is enduring as seeing the invisible. A particular age or council cannot be given authority over all other ages. While history is still in the making no one chapter can prevent the next being written. . . . The mind is of God as much as the spirit or soul, and as participator in the Eternal Mind, must be granted its right to seek and test and accept truth.'

Dr. Angus recalls that some years ago the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia appointed a committee to consider the re-statement of the Church's faith, and in Great Britain a Commission has been engaged on the same very difficult task for the Church of England.

Points in Dispute.

Dr. Angus was accused of 'stripping' the figure of Jesus of historic doctrines concerning the nature of His Personality. The following extract reveals the nature of his reply:

'Jesus has nothing to fear from the application of the most searching and thorough-going criticism. How could we be satisfied with a Lord Whose cause must be protected from all criticism? In effect, criticism brings not loss but gain to the cause of Jesus; it enthrones Him on an unshakeable lordship. It is only when the Person of Jesus has been stripped of the later accretions and mythological speculations that the real grandeur of His divine personality stands out challengingly. We are then confronted with a personality Who comes near to us and wins and holds our deepest loyalty. . . . Men may rid their thoughts of the Christologies, but they shall never free their imaginations from the majestically sublime personality, Whose greatness gave birth to those very Christologies which His enduring spirit and influence leave sooner or later as derelicts on the sands of time.

Mythology treated as history is one thing; mythology put under tribute to bring out the lasting significance of the Divine humanity is another matter. That historical life, because that life was wholly true, asserts its dominion over the lives of grateful volunteers. Jesus shall reign until a higher motive than love appears in human conduct and aspiration. Jesus shall reign until a more excellent way to true selfhood (which is neither selflessness nor selfishness) than self-sacrifice comes within our moral ken.'

The Charge of Unitarianism.

Dr. Angus refuses to base the belief that 'God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world to Himself' with belief in a historic virgin birth, nor to make faith in His living presence dependent on belief in the reanimation of His dead body in the sepulchre. Like most New Testament scholars, he finds evidence, within the structure of the Gospels themselves, that legend has been working on the earliest memories. This has given rise to the charge of Unitarianism, which the Professor contends is as meaningless as a charge of witchcraft, because it rests on an obsolete and unsatisfying conception of God as being separate from His creation and on an inadequate conception of man.

> 'The yawning gulf which once separated the Divine and the human is discovered to have been an hallucination; the philosophy of the Divine Immanence has made the fellowship of our spirits with the Father of spirits a practical and potentializing reality. To-day, when in our knowledge of God through Jesus Christ we cannot assert that the Divine Father differs from us, His sons, essentially in kind, we cannot be asked to say that Jesus our Lord differs from us essentially in kind. . . . He in Whose Divine humanity we have recognized the incarnation of the Father Himself, is not ashamed to call us brothers. The same Divine Spirit which dwelt in Him dwells in us according to the measure of our personality. The charge of Unitarianism, even if possible, has no relation to the practical work of the Kingdom of God in the present. . . . But what the mature religious conscience requires is, not a semi-God or a supernatural Being of another order and from another world, but a veritable Son of God and Leader Who elicits our faith by His own achievements on the open battlefield of human life, and also wins our love and loyalty by believing in us.

The Resurrection.

> While controversialists are discussing the intricate questions of resurrection, and of reanimation of a body from the tomb and the subsequent fate of a resuscitated body, we may proclaim without fear of contradiction that Jesus lives in the lives of His followers, and that such life matters more to the world than all theories about resurrection and reanimation. He is the ever-living Lord, and we have been raised with Him to sit in the heavenly places of life. He is a Presence to be felt and known in darkness and in light. Truly God has given unto us Eternal Life, and this Life is in His Son. Death for us has no terrors. It is overcome in the higher obediences of daily life and in our attitude to the things that are unseen and eternal.'

Propitiation.

Another charge brought against Dr. Angus was that of denying the doctrine that Christ's death was a propitiation for our

sins. After stating five controversial questions which arise out of this doctrine, he writes:

> 'While these questions are being answered by theologians . . . may we not meanwhile go on proclaiming that Christ died for us, leaving us an example that we should follow in His steps Who did no sin, and thus continue His redemptive work for the world? May we not find a challenge in the death of Jesus more important than all theories, that as He laid down His life for us, so ought we to lay down our lives for our brothers? While theologians are discussing the place of sacrifice in religion, we may remind ourselves that the only kind of sacrifice required by Jesus was self-sacrifice, and that self-sacrifice is the only sacrifice required by Christianity or of any service to the world.'

He quotes the philosopher Pringle Pattison to the effect that the intensest realization of self is to be found in the Pauline phrase 'dying to live'—in the words of Jesus, 'losing one's life to find it.' This is 'the open secret of the universe.'

Professor Angus concludes his address delivered before the New South Wales General Assembly with these words:

> 'The late Dr. Lyman Abbott divided the teachers of the modern Church into three classes: those who endeavour to defend the *faith* of the fathers and also the *forms* in which that faith was expressed; those who repudiate both the ancient *faith* and the antique *forms*; and those who hold fast the *faith*, while discarding or modifying the *forms*, and labour to restate the faith in forms more rational and consistent with modern habits of thought. Which kind of teacher does this Assembly desire? One who repeats venerable traditions? Or one who also seeks, without any claim to infallibility, to teach living truth?'
>
> 'Over a generation ago Benjamin Jowett wrote:
>
> "Religion is not dependent on historical events, the report of which we cannot altogether trust. Holiness has its sources elsewhere than in history."'
>
> 'I believe in the permanent leadership of Christ, but not in the permanent validity of dogmas about His Person. The Spirit of Him Who loved us and gave Himself for us is of more value to ourselves and of more immediate relevancy to the world than the most correct and infallible theories concerning His Passion or Person.
>
> Let us not forget that "doctrine is deposited like crystals when the seething flow of inspiration begins to grow cold," but inspiration is more vital and potential than the institution which was built historically as a response to a mighty intuition of a Revealer of God. The most venerable creeds of the Church should be regarded as milestones of the Church's march toward its ideal rather than as immovable dwelling-places of the Church's thought. Their propositions and definitions, bearing a more intimate relation to the thought and problems of their age, should be to us rather symbols of truth and suggestive parables than legal enactments.
>
> Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be.
> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And thou, O Lord, art more than they.'

The Professor's Standing.

This trial, though it will cause much pain to a sensitive man, should do great good in bringing home to the Australian public the fact that it is the most distinguished theologians of to-day who are simplifying and rationalizing the work of the theologians of the past, and carrying on their predecessors' work in the fellowship of the same strenuous spirit. It is the Biblical critics who are making the Bible live. 'Let us,' writes Dr. Angus, 'revere our fathers' memories, but not remain inert by their graves.'

Dr. Angus is perhaps the scholar best known to the outside world that Australia has yet produced. His book, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (John Murray, 1929), is a contribution of outstanding importance. During the past thirteen years the Professor has been attacked on several occasions, but none of these former onslaughts has been pressed beyond the circle in which his personal influence is felt. The strength of Dr. Angus' position strategically is in the devotion that he has inspired among past and present students who rally fervently to his defence. In the past his pupils have made clear that their own willingness to enter the Presbyterian ministry depends on their teacher's liberty of prophesying.

BOOK REVIEWS

A GREAT BOOK ON PRAYER*

Dr. Heiler's great work on prayer (worthy to rank with Wm. James' *Varieties of Religious Experience*), which first appeared in Germany towards the end of the World War, has now been translated into English by Dr. Samuel McComb with the assistance of Dr. J. Edgar Park. Those who do not easily read German owe a deep debt of gratitude to the translators, who have thus provided access to a book which has won the warm approbation of many experts, including Baron von Hügel and the Dean of St. Paul's. The translators have done their work well; the style is attractive and the book is thoroughly readable. Dr. Heiler has himself had a wide experience of worship in different communions, having proceeded 'from Roman Catholicism to Evangelical Catholicism, from the Roman community to the Lutheran, and to kindly relations with the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Churches' (Author's Preface). The work abounds in illustrations drawn from every type of religion, and there are countless quotations from the writings of men of prayer of every age, race, culture and creed.

* *Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion.* By Friedrich Heiler. Translated and edited by Samuel McComb, with the assistance of J. Edgar Park. (Oxford University Press, 1932.; 2nd ed. 1933. 376 pp. Price 16/-.)

Dr. Heiler's treatment of the subject is psychological, not philosophical. In fact, his book ranks as one of the most important contributions to the psychology of religion. He discusses from a psychological point of view the way in which 'rational philosophical thought means the disintegration and dissolution of prayer' (p. 102), and leads to the position so frankly stated by Kant: 'He who has made progress in the good life ceases to pray, for candour is one of its first maxims.' He agrees with Sabatier that the religion of philosophers, or natural religion, is not genuine religion, but is at bottom only philosophy and abstraction. Those who are troubled in their prayer-life by philosophical questionings will doubtless be helped by Dr. Heiler's treatment of their problem, although he does not attempt any philosophical justification of prayer. 'The severely non-rational character of religion nowhere makes so overwhelming an impression as in prayer. For modern thought, dominated by Copernicus and Kant, prayer is a great stone of stumbling, as it was for the enlightened philosophy of the Greeks . . . There are only two possibilities: either decisively to affirm prayer "in its entirely non-rational character and with all its difficulties," as Ménégoz says, or to surrender genuine prayer and substitute for it adoration and devotion which resemble prayer' (p. 362). But prayer is the essence of religion, and is something more than adoration, contemplation, absorption, mystical union, or ethical inspiration. 'Prayer is a living communion of the religious man with God, conceived as personal and present in experience, a communion which reflects the forms of the social relations of humanity' (p. 358), *e.g.*, those of 'suppliant with judge, servant with master, child with father, bride with bridegroom' (p. 362).

Dr. Heiler discusses the origins of prayer in the life of primitive man, and traces its later development in its two main forms, mysticism and prophetic religion. 'Mysticism is passive, quietist, resigned, contemplative; the prophetic religion is active, challenging, desiring, ethical. The mystic aims at the extinction of the emotional and volitional life, for the delight of ecstasy can be purchased only at the price of killing the will to live. In prophetic experience the emotions blaze up, the will to live asserts itself, triumphs in external defeat, and defies death and annihilation' (p. 142). His division of mystical religion into its main types is very helpful: (i) Sacramental and Cultural (should not this be 'Cultual'?), (ii) Nuptial, (iii) Quietist, and (iv) Aesthetic or Nature Mysticism. But mystical experience is not prayer, and often even denies the value of prayer; and to this extent at least mysticism is not the essence of religion. Prophetic prayer, as found in the Psalms, Jesus, Paul or Luther, carries us more directly to the very heart of religion.

The chapter on 'Prayer in Public Worship' gives an admirable account of the origin, growth and value of common prayer. Catholic and Evangelical types of public prayer are compared and their value is assessed. 'Both the Catholic and Evangelical forms of worship have, though in different ways, abandoned the primitive Christian form of worship and have modelled themselves on pre-Christian forms [the mystery-liturgies and the Synagogue worship respectively]. But whilst the intellectual sobriety of Evangelical worship can only with difficulty set free the vital forces of personal piety, the Catholic liturgy of the Mass, with its numinous, mysterious quality and its wealth of sensuous and aesthetic stimuli, has been for centuries the starting-point of mystical prayer and contemplation. Nevertheless the ideal of public worship is that of Protestantism. The spiritual adoration of God by an assembly of spiritually mature personalities is the highest and purest form of worship, the true divine service' (p. 346).

The serious student will probably lament the lack of footnotes, references and documentation; but the ordinary reader will consider their omission a benefit rather than a hindrance. It is a book both for the scholar and the general reader, We are glad to see that it has gone into a second edition and expect that it will go into many more.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

THE USE AND ABUSE OF CREEDS*

Dr. Major's book is both timely and valuable—timely because he reminds us that, though the problem of clerical veracity is not now so acute, it still remains a grievous stumbling-block to honest minds, and valuable because he undertakes the double task which we must discharge if we are to explain our position to those honest minds. Every one of us must be familiar with enquirers who are powerfully attracted by the religion of Jesus Christ but who hesitate to discuss it with us, until at last we discover that they cannot get over the plain fact that we make public profession of beliefs which they cannot share and which they cannot think that we really hold. With such enquirers we have first to explain what the creeds actually contain and why they contain it, and then to point out with what hesitations and under what constraints we assent to them. Hitherto, though there have been many admirable expositions of the creeds, and some noble pleas for the clergy in their use of them, there has been no small book which could be put into the enquirers' hands. Dr. Major has produced for us exactly what we have often spent hours in trying to expound; and he has done so with a simplicity of language, a brevity and clearness of arrangement, and a generosity of spirit which are wholly admirable.

The temper of the book is set by a brief sketch of Dr. Major's own experience of the passage from rigid traditionalism to scholarship and freedom. He lets us see his own conflict, and therein at once his religious earnestness and his intellectual honesty. Having thus established sympathy he can put forward his position in a way that will attract even those who cannot share it. Those who assume (sometimes with justice) that the Modernist is academic and slightly supercilious, provocative and scornful of tradition, arid and sceptical, will find this book an answer to their assumptions. It is an apologia for which we cannot be too grateful: it is Dr. Major as his friends know and revere him.

Seven of the nine chapters are concerned with exposition of the function and growth of Creeds and with the three Creeds in use in the Anglican Communion. They are a masterpiece of condensation, covering all the essential points, and discussing with sufficient fulness most of the issues of special difficulty. Yet brief as they are, Dr. Major seldom touches any subject without giving freshness and independence to its treatment. Inevitably some of his contentions arouse questioning. Is the choice simply between a literal apocalyptic and his own belief that this element is a later insertion? Is it certain that the earliest belief in the Resurrection of Jesus was in a resuscitation of His physical body (see p. 46 and compare p. 72)? Is it fair in view of St. Paul's repeated affirmations to ascribe to St. John the belief that the physical body was transformed? Would it have been possible for the Church of the early days, when syncretism was a real danger and Christian experience was recent and unformulated, to preserve the essentials without some measure of exclusion? Is it easy to reconcile the thoroughly Jewish character of the Lukan birth-narrative with the belief that the idea

* *The Church's Creeds and the Modern Man.* By H. D. A. Major, D.D. (Skeffington. The Modernist Series, 1933. 3/6.)

of the virgin-birth only arose in Gentile circles and as a result of the LXX version of Isaiah vii, 14?

To this last subject Dr. Major naturally devotes more space; and his treatment of it is complicated by being divided (pp. 23-9 and 65-9) and by a misleading footnote on p. 23. He confines himself to the historical problem, and sets out with excellent clearness the chief difficulties in the narratives and the chief reasons which lead to a belief that the doctrine is late and unnecessary. We could wish that space had permitted him to go into the theology of the problem, and show not only that the belief is irrelevant to faith in the Incarnation, but that by seeming to remove Jesus from our species it has had serious effects upon the true appreciation of his manhood.

In the two chapters on the Nicene Creed the excellent point is made that it was the Arians who were traditionalists, while Athanasius was not afraid to modernise. That Greek orthodoxy with its insistence upon the aseity of God the Father (who indeed ceased to be 'Father' and became the philosopher's Absolute) was inherently binitarian is indisputable; and Athanasius, in the interest of religious experience and the conviction that only very God could save the sinner, challenged it. That he originated or indeed wholly approved the word 'homoousion' is more questionable. Almost certainly it was derived from the West, from Tertullian by way of Hosius; and Athanasius like the rest of the East regarded it as Sabellian, and only used it freely after his first exile. Dr. Major might indeed have strengthened his case against tritheism and his plea for a return to the Creed of 325 if he had noted that Athanasius and the 'old Nicenes' never use the analogy of three human beings in expounding the Trinity, and were definitely stronger in their insistence on the divine Unity than the Cappadocians and the later orthodoxy.

Very attractive is Dr. Major's plea for a return to the Logos-theology, that earliest and most modern of all the modes of doctrine. Certainly it is in Clement and possibly also Origen that we have the only *schema* which does justice to the universality of the divine energy, to the evolutionary process, and to the kinship of Christ with humanity. Dr. Major recognises that the Logos-doctrine needs careful interpretation. In its history we can clearly trace grave defects; and these help to explain its supersession. It may well be doubted whether it could be satisfactorily restated unless emphasis was laid upon points which in its original form it ignored. But the suggestion is one that deserves full consideration.

Of Dr. Major's two final chapters in which he pleads for liberty to use new creeds and discusses the position of the clergy and clerical honesty there can be no criticism. Both in substance and in manner they are admirable—dignified and yet moving, sincere and considerate, a model of what such an appeal should be. It remains for us to do what we can to see that they are not ignored.

CHARLES E. RAVEN.

THE BIRTH OF JESUS*

In offering a new contribution to the study of the Birth of Jesus, Dr. Elwood Worcester, of Boston, Massachusetts, indicates in his preface his intention: it is to put before the reader all the known evidence, together with the comments which must be made on that evidence, and to let judgment be made by the reader. 'Above all,' he says, 'I have not consciously attempted to *prove* anything.'

* *Studies in the Birth of the Lord.* By Elwood Worcester. (Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933. 10/6.)

Dr. Worcester's procedure is clear: in the second chapter he explains how the Hebrews thought of God as specially active in the birth of great men, and having thus set the birth stories in Matthew and Luke in a historical perspective he goes on to examine them. He concludes that these birth stories and the genealogies are additions to the body of the gospels and he comments on the obvious differences between Matthew and Luke which show their independence of one another. The way to the understanding of Matthew is appreciation of his misinterpretation of *Isaiah* vii, 14, due to his use of the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew original,[1] but a thorough discussion is made of the bearing of the Syrian Palimpsest on the text of Matthew, the result being to show two traditions, one of a genealogy from Jacob to Joseph and from Joseph to Jesus, and the other that of the Virgin Birth; the Evangelist was as unwilling to abandon the genealogy pointing to royal descent as he was to abandon the story of the Virgin Birth. In chapter 8 Dr. Worcester concludes that the oldest version of the story in Matthew was that Mary as the wife of Joseph bore him a son, and 'a few deft touches . . . were sufficient to transform profoundly its original import.'

After attacking strongly Vincent Taylor's view that γεννάω can be interpreted as 'be the father of' in a putative sense, in chapters 9 and 10 Dr. Worcester insists upon the non-Jewish character of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth and by an elaborate analysis of Luke's narrative shows the predominantly Jewish characteristics of that story. After noticing the suggestion that *Luke* i, 34-5, be cut out as the only evidence of the Virgin Birth and on the ground that they awkwardly compel Luke to make Mary go to Bethlehem with Joseph, to whom she was only betrothed, Dr. Worcester adopts the old reading τῇ γυναικί in ii, 5, and decides that only the words ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γιγνώσκω need be deleted in i, 34-5 (on stylistic grounds). The difficulty of the word παρθένον in v. 2, 27 and that of deciding when the marriage of Joseph and Mary took place are fully acknowledged.

In chapter 14 the interesting suggestion of Dr. Barton is mentioned, that Luke got his birth story from Apollos, an Alexandrian influenced by Philo's views of the supernatural element in the birth of 'children of promise' in the Old Testament; the importance of John the Baptist's birth in the narrative is thus explained (cf. *Acts* xviii, 24-6). Chapters 16-18 consider the possibility of Buddhistic influences and a possible origin of the story of the visit of the Magi in Matthew; and the next two chapters make the review of appropriate literature complete by setting forth the miserable fables about Jesus' birth in late Jewish writings. Chapter 21 describes the Protevangelicum, that 'first chapter in the long history of Mariolatry,' and the book ends with a 'Tentative Solution' and 'Conclusion.'

Dr. Worcester suggests that 'the New Testament is to be regarded as the glorification rather than the history of Jesus,' and that as Christianity spread in the Graeco-Roman World, it lost touch with its Hebrew ancestor and allowed itself a glorification of its Lord at the expense of history: the early Gnostics went a step further than Philo. Dr. Worcester's evaluation of the stories may be gathered from his own words:

'Strange to say, it is in these birth stories that the highest claims

[1] In a footnote on p. 45 a small mistake is made which classical scholarship demands be corrected. Dr. Worcester writes: 'The Greek word παυθένος, like the Hebrew Almah, meant originally only "young woman," whether married or not. The Iliad II, 514, uses it to designate a young married woman.' This is incorrect: in the passage cited, Astyche, while still a virgin, is visited by the god Ares, to whom she bears two sons.

of our religion are put forward. The truth of such statements depends not on biological facts which, even if true, can never prove divinity, but on a fine and just perception of Jesus' place in the moral universe' (pp. 292-3).

Insisting that the narratives must be afforded honest and honourable treatment, he concludes his book with the words:

'This treatment, however, applies only to the letter, not to the spirit, whose pure and lofty purpose is to glorify Jesus, the only being in the long procession of humanity who deserves our absolute love and praise. In this sense we confess with full conviction, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." It is only materialism which judges the physical to be either more true or more important than the spiritual' (p. 294).

About the actual doctrine of the Virgin Birth Dr. Worcester is more emphatic:

'The doctrine of the Virgin Birth was formulated primarily to safeguard and to guarantee the sinlessness of Jesus, but even in the early Church it was not deemed sufficient . . . and the Church of Rome in 1854 found it necessary to guard the birth of the Lord from possible contamination through her dogma of the Immaculate Conception . . . This heresy led to the obliteration of all human traits and qualities, the cutting of all brotherly ties, and it has opened the door in our own times to the denial of Jesus' very existence' (pp. 89-90).

Again, speaking of the separation between the Church and the Synagogue:

'This perhaps is the highest price we have paid for the doctrine of the Virgin Birth — alienation, bitterness, mutual hatred, and contempt . . . In no other phase of its history does the religion of Israel sink so low as in its vile aspersions on the Holy Family and in its repudiation of the Saviour of mankind. Nowhere else, perhaps, has Christianity so falsified its own principles or so flagrantly denied the precepts of its Master as in the hatred and persecution with which it has visited Israel's rejection of the Saviour of mankind . . . Whether or not this doctrine be literally true, the religious world has paid a heavy price for it.'

It would be impossible to deny either the success of Dr. Worcester's attempt to analyse and discuss with good temper and fairness a very controversial subject, or his earnestness in undertaking it: his book attains his object, which was to make it a readable guide to the problems connected with the Virgin Birth, and it may be described as an excellent handbook to the subject, and even an indispensable preliminary for a teacher who would undertake to explain exactly how the belief in the Virgin Birth arose. His own views on this Dr. Worcester does not make clear, and his textual criticism, at least of the Gospel of St. Luke, will not be accepted by everyone. But it must be agreed that, Dr. Worcester's views apart, the evidence is set out with great clarity and fairness. He purposed to let the facts speak for themselves, and he has neither lent them a megaphone nor muzzled them; the reader's impression is that their utterance is in no uncertain voice.

A. R. C. Leaney.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

The Bishop of Gloucester set himself last year in his Third Visitation Charge to present his diocesan clergy with a summary of the message which it is their business to deliver. This Charge he has now expanded into a book.* Though writing as a professed theologian, throughout the book, as in the Charge, he has in mind the reader who has had no special theological training. His direct and clear style, his ability to sketch a position with a few bold strokes, enable him to appeal effectively to the public which he has in mind.

The first half of the book is devoted to a presentation of the Christian Faith. Dr. Headlam urges that, though the existence of God is not logically demonstrable, it is a postulate of human experience whether intellectual, moral, or aesthetic; but pre-eminently is it the postulate of moral experience. If this postulate be accepted, in the concrete religious life which results abstract difficulties such as the problem of the existence of evil disappear. It is in our inner experience that we have the most direct knowledge of reality. We are not in the position of an external observer surveying existence from outside. If we pose as such, we need not be surprised that we are involved in all kinds of difficulties. The religious man finds that, so far as he himself is concerned, the problems which in the abstract may seem insoluble cease to distress him. It is from the position thus gained that he faces the challenge of life.

Faith in Jesus Christ has a real historical basis. Though no intelligent person will claim anything like verbal inerrancy for the Gospel records, they do contain authentic history. In fact not only do they provide sustenance for the religious life, but they also embody material adequate for the construction, within limits, of an intelligible life of Christ. Starting from the Gospel records, Dr. Headlam justifies the fully developed Catholic Christology on the ground that it gives a coherent explanation of the facts recorded in the Gospels. He will abate none of its rigour. He insists, for instance, that, though our Lord had a human nature, He had not a human personality. This conception has been likened to Lewis Carroll's conception of the grin of the Cheshire cat without the cat, and we fear that to the type of reader to whom the book is addressed, it will seem a conception no less elusive. Such metaphysical refinements no doubt have a meaning for the theological antiquarian, but they can only amaze and repel the modern man. They belong to an alien intellectual climate. Dr. Headlam himself seems to admit as much when he remarks that such technicalities convey little to those who are not theologians, and that the all-important element in the doctrine of the Incarnation is that it expresses belief in a real revelation of God. Would it not therefore be wiser to discard such impedimenta when we pass outside the door of the academic lecture-room?

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit Dr. Headlam bases on the religious experience of the Apostolic community as authenticated by the subsequent unbroken demand of the Christian Church. Just as our moral convictions demand a transcendent God, so our religious needs demand an immanent God. 'As the Creator who is almighty, God has limited his own power, first by the creation of the world and then by the creation of the free spirit of man. But the world that he created is still the expression of his will, and his spirit is immanent in all things. And man, if free, may be influenced, as one free spirit may be influenced by another,

* *What it means to be a Christian.* By the Right Rev. A. C. Headlam, C.H., D.D. (Published by Faber and Faber, Ltd. 1933. Price 6/- net.)

by the working of the Divine Spirit. The Christian God is transcendent and immanent, but his immanence is not the immanence of Pantheism. It is the influence in the world of a God who is without the world.'

The doctrine of the Trinity is, according to Dr. Headlam, in a sense, a New Testament doctrine, for it is 'the best possible way in which the Church has been able to sum up what is implied in a number of separate propositions, all of which are contained in the New Testament.' It is 'an expression in human language adapted to human needs of things which transcend experience, and therefore cannot be fully capable of expression in terms of experience.' It is necessarily expressed in symbolical language, difficult to realize or understand. We might add that it is also expressed in the terminology of the metaphysics of a by-gone age. Moreover, the 'separate propositions' contained in the New Testament are not, in their setting, parts of any systematic theology and it is only at the cost of a strained exegesis that they can all be forced into the framework of a system of theology which aims at self-consistency. Dr. Headlam might therefore well add that the difficulty of the doctrine is a necessary result of the need which theologians felt at each stage of its development to express it in a form which was not inconsistent with a number of 'separate propositions' which on the face of them are far from consistent one with the other. The root difficulty, in other words, proceeded from the assumption that the writings of the New Testament were infallible doctrinally in the whole and in the part, even to each sentence.

In the chapter which deals with the Trinity there is no discussion of the meaning of the word *Person*. 'Next as to the question of personality,' writes Dr. Headlam, 'whatever personality may mean . . .' and leaves it at that, though he goes on repeatedly to refer to the Persons of the Trinity. The Christian believer will not be content to regard the terms in which his faith is expressed as of the nature of an algebraical x. He will inevitably give them some content. He usually gives the term *Person* a content which lands him in formal heresy. It is those who are most firmly assured of their orthodoxy, plain blunt people, who are most addicted to tritheism. Perhaps this would not matter very seriously as regards Trinitarianism, but that the perverse form in which the doctrine is commonly held lands the believer into a tangled mass of inconsistencies. Mystery degenerates into muddle. There is no muddle if with the Schoolmen we regard the Father as Power, the Son as the Thought of God and the Holy Spirit as Divine Love.

Dr. Headlam, while reverencing the Catholic tradition, is no mere traditionalist. He has too firm a grasp on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit for that.

'Whenever old-fashioned people shut their eyes to progress,' he writes, 'the progressive people become revolutionary. Church history shows that progress is not made by clinging obstinately to tradition, nor by plunging into new ideas, but by the moderation of the worker who calmly and judiciously sifts new truths. If we properly understand the doctrine of the Holy Spirit we shall refuse to shut our ears to new ideas and new interpretations. We are bound to believe that God works now as formerly through inspired human intellects. The Holy Ghost is that Spirit of godly wisdom which enables us to reject what is false: he is that Spirit which worked in the Church in the past, and which works in the Church now. Our belief is not in the infallibility of any age or person, or in any body of persons, but in the Holy Spirit gradually revealing God's truth through what is highest in every age.'

From the Christian Faith Dr. Headlam passes to its fruit, the Christian Life, and discusses at some length the problems connected with sex and citizenship. He deprecates the usurpation by Christians *qua* Christians of the functions of the politician and economist. True religion will produce good citizens, but it will not provide them with an economic or political programme. The Christian will seek peace and ensue it; but, in Dr. Headlam's opinion, he will not necessarily be a Pacifist, war often being 'the inevitable result of a society of imperfect men.'

> 'Issues are rarely clear in human affairs, but if a man's country is attacked, it is his Christian duty to be ready to give up his life in defence of it. He must be ready to give up his life for the sake of others. He is fulfilling the most fundamental of Christian duties.'

The three concluding chapters of the book deal with the Christian Church, the Sacraments, and the Hope of Immortality. Of these the first two expound in outline the position familiar to students of Dr. Headlam's larger works. The last is one of the most valuable chapters of his present book.

G. L. H. Harvey.

CHRISTIAN THINKERS OF THE WEST*

It is the conviction of Professor McGiffert that, for a clear understanding of the development of Christian thought, it is far better to have a fuller acquaintance with a few great Christian thinkers than a more superficial and merely hearsay acquaintance with a much larger number. The study of Christian thought is the study of Christian thinkers. Consequently, the method has been followed of dealing in considerable detail with a few important figures and quoting freely from their writings instead of passing many in review' (p. ix).

The present volume is the second in a series which, it is hoped, will ultimately cover the whole history of Christian thought. Volume I considered Early and Eastern, and the present volume deals with Western thought from Tertullian to Erasmus. It is a work of extreme discrimination. Clarity of purpose has led to clarity of presentation. The narrative is often so plain and unhesitating that one fails to discern the skill and care with which the irrelevant has been omitted and the unimportant compressed. It is a rare example of literary economy. The whole book reveals a liberal standpoint, but in the majority of chapters the method is expository rather than critical. In most sections, a brief biographical note is followed by a lucid account of the thinker, illustrated by ample quotations which show not only erudition but care in selection. Apart from two chapters on the Sacraments and Church and Papacy, the remaining fifteen are devoted to figures of intellectual and spiritual eminence, with special reference to Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. According to Professor McGiffert, the writings of Augustine reveal rather than overcome the conflicting influences to which he was subject.

A study of Augustine's doctrine of God and man and sin and grace prompts the opinion that 'The curious combination in all this of mystical piety, Neoplatonic philosophy, Manichaean dualism, Christian tradition, strained exegesis, rigorous logic and glaring inconsistencies born of religious instincts and moral needs, can hardly be matched anywhere else in the history of human thought' (p. 99). An instance of Augustine's inconsistency, which may also serve to illustrate the felicitous manner of presentation, is his attitude towards the story of the Fall. 'Why should

* *A History of Christian Thought*. By A. C. McGiffert. (Scribner's Sons, 1933. 12/6.)

there be evil in a universe created out of nothing by a Being who is both good and all-powerful? Consistently with his Neoplatonic conception of evil as mere negation, as the loss or diminution of being, Augustine explained the evil in the world by the tendency of all created things to lapse again into the nothingness from which they came. This tendency God alone can withstand' (p. 89). 'Therefore quite apart from any act of Adam's, men are bound, if left to themselves, to choose self instead of God; that is, they are bound to sin as Adam was. In spite of this, under the influence of Catholic tradition, Augustine accepted the doctrine of original sin and used it to explain the sins of Adam's descendants. The result was untold confusion' (p. 90). Thomas Aquinas is represented as the modernist of the thirteenth century in his attempt to synthesize Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology. 'His attitude was similar to that of many a liberal theologian of the nineteenth century who undertook to reinterpret Christianity in the light of Darwinism, not for the purpose of undermining and destroying Christianity, as their orthodox opponents thought, but to make it possible for the two to live harmoniously together' (p. 259). 'It is interesting that a theologian who was in his day a modernist should bear the reputation of being one of the leading conservatives in the history of the Church' (p. 294). This may prove a consolation to the speculative, but the consolation is reserved for those who believe that their speculations have the profundity of those of St. Thomas. Alongside the dogmatic development, Professor McGiffert traces with sympathy the mystical and ethical types of Christianity as represented by Eckhart and Erasmus. Without the Protestant revolt these elements might have flourished harmoniously together, but conflict produced in the Church 'such a hardening of temper and narrowing of platform as unfitted to meet the needs of the dawning age' (p. 395).

The book may be thoroughly recommended as an excellent example of the biographical method and is admirable either for the student or the general reader. As a guide to further study, a valuable bibliography is appended of English, French and German works, with comments as to their nature and value.

G. F. Woods.

BIRTH CONTROL AMONG ROMAN CATHOLICS*

*Roman Catholic Methods of Birth Control** by Dr. M. C. Stopes is an immensely interesting book and serves a very valuable purpose. The great opponent of the use of contraceptives and so of eugenic Birth Control is the Roman Catholic Church, and as a consequence in the Irish Free State, where that Church is a real power, the proportion of bachelors is much higher than in England, and the size of the families of married people much larger. It would also appear that in the Irish Free State infanticide is on the increase. However, the important point is this, that the Roman Catholic Church seems now, to judge from a large collection of *data,* in Dr. Stopes' volume, to be weakening in its opposition. Yet *more Romano* her public official pronouncements are very different from what is permitted by the priest in his pastoral office. We observe that the *Catholic Herald* in its issue of August 26th, 1933, refers to this volume by Dr. Stopes in the following terms:—

> 'The business [of the use of contraceptives] is a dirty one and is chiefly engaged in for money making and so is of the lowest type of

* By Marie Carmichael Stopes, D.Sc., Ph.D (Published 1933 by Peter Davies, London. 6/-.)

pornography. It has demoralised the homes of the nation and chiefly of the young women of the land to whom the word 'purity' is unknown and who find that with the aid of the propagandists they can emulate the lives of their sisters of the streets.'

Again:

'Under the flair heading of "DENUNCIATION OF STOPERY: PRIESTS' SCATHING INDICTMENT," in the *Catholic Herald* for the 5th September, 1931, we read that Father W. D. Conolly, O.S.B., said that "birth prevention was the greatest violation of nature: an attempt to prevent the fulfilment of the designs of God." And in the *Morning Post* (24th March, 1931), Cardinal Bourne is reported to have said about sterilisation and birth control: "There was in those practices something more degrading even than the evils of war"' (p. 5).

Nevertheless, the Roman Casuists are beginning by subtle distinctions to create loopholes for the use of contraceptive methods and some have even dared to enunciate general principles which must permit the use of them. For instance, Fr. Henry Davis, S.J., in his pamphlet *State Sterilization of the Unfit,* published in 1931 writes:—

'It is simply indefensible to maintain that marital relations may never be exercised except when offspring should ensue.'

In his article 'The Vocation of Marriage' in the *Catholic Times* of February 6th, 1931, he writes:—

'If an only child is the deliberate fruit of the union, parents do no moral wrong if they have no more children.'

There can be little doubt that contraceptive methods of birth-control are being practised and in an increasing degree in the Roman Catholic Church.

The plain man asks when will Rome have the courage and honesty to sanction openly what it permits privately? The answer is a simple one. 'When circumstances compel her—and not before. Control of marital relations is a means to power, and what is a means to power the Roman Church never relinquishes until forced to do so.' Dr. Stopes has done a notable service not only to eugenics but also to the claims of truth in producing this important volume. On page 17 Dr. Stopes gives a list of contraceptive methods permitted by the Roman authorities:—

'A. To refrain altogether from the sex act. This is *abstinence,* and is *not* a form of birth control. (*See* definition on p. 25).

B. To use coitus accompanied by means of birth control.

(1) Arranging coitus according to the calendar, choosing those days only when the woman is presumed to be infertile. This is the 'safe period,' or *tempus ageneseon,* or *tempus inter-menstruum.*

(2) To use and enjoy ordinary coitus at any time, but to interfere with the physiological reactions so that after excitation, erection, and intromission, only ejaculation is prevented. This is *coitus reservatus.* (It is to be distinguished from *coitus interruptus,* which is a deadly sin.)

C. The use of normal and completed coitus followed by certain quite 'natural' actions, such as sitting up in bed and coughing violently, arising and urinating with rapid abdominal movements, etc. I do not find these methods explicitly mentioned in her theological works, but in general all *natural* actions being permitted it is not necessary for such natural actions to be reported in confession, and

knowledge of their partial efficacy as birth-control methods passes from one woman to another. They are not very reliable, but they are used with success by some women all the world over.'

Dr. Dearmer, Canon of Westminster, contributes an outspoken and arresting introduction to this volume, in which he writes :—

'Slowly and reluctantly I have been forced to the conclusion that the Roman Catholic Church is not so much a religious community as a great political machine, endeavouring to control our newspapers and other sources of information, and to acquire a dominating position, through a small but highly organized minority vote, over the affairs of Great Britain . . . it is of great importance that some of the facts mentioned in this book should be widely known. The overflowing of the Irish Romanist population is produced at the cost of much pain, disease and death among the women. It is not possible any longer to doubt that an attempt is being made, through immigration from Southern Ireland, gradually to drive the English out of England and the Scots out of Scotland.'

Hugh Walpole, the novelist, writes in a prefatory not to this book:—

'It will, I hope, appeal especially to fair-minded Roman Catholics—but its *general* effect must be important and valuable.'

Professor Julian Huxley and Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane are no less emphatic on the value of Dr. Stopes' contribution to the Cause of Eugenics. The former writes:—

'Dr. Stopes has done a real service in writing this book. Grave questions are involved and she has brought them out of the fog of veiled allusion and circumlocution in which they have been wrapped, and which has too often permitted unscrupulous opponents to confuse the issue. A number of important facts concerning the Roman Catholic position on birth control are here set down, amply documented, in black and white, so that the public can form their own judgments on this important subject.'

And the latter, in a letter addressed to Dr. Stopes asserts that :—

'The intelligence of the public has been aroused, and they have at last grasped the enormous importance of the work which you have so carefully and courageously done. Your work will stand for ever, in spite of any effort which is being made to oppose or depreciate it. I am very pleased that I have been associated with you from its commencement, and I feel that Birth Control is the most important factor in the improvement of the health, happiness, and prosperity of the human race. I am sick to death with the futile efforts of bodies to stem the rising tide of progress.'

As Modernists we feel deeply grateful to our episcopate that it took the right line in this difficult question in the last Lambeth Conference pronouncements, but the matter cannot end there. It is the duty of the English Church through its clergy and laity both to proclaim and practise moral and scientific Birth Control and fearlessly to dissipate the obscurantism and confute the casuistry which is immorally opposing this crusade.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

At first sight this letter may seem largely of a personal kind : but, even if that were so, the explanation it contains is due to those of your readers who have read my writings. In reality, however, the remarks I shall make arise from deep problems which are of far more than merely individual personal interest.

On some occasions I have written in your pages (as also elsewhere—both in periodicals and in book-form) on the subject of the Roman Catholic Church. It has been my aim to be fair and impartial; but, since 1926, the spirit of adverse criticism has been largely apparent — I having left that Church at the end of that year.

I wish now to say that I have been received back into the Roman Church, having come to the conclusion that the true balance, or 'criterion,' of Christian faith is that which it is the office of the Roman Church to keep, and that difficulties over secondary matters had caused me to be drawn away from that true balance.

The underlying problem is this : If Christianity is a definite, doctrinal Revelation, would it not need, as the teacher of such Revelation, an institution which shall be divinely protected from being mistaken in essential matters? If, on the other hand, Christianity is not a definite, doctrinal Revelation, and needs no such an infallible organ, then it would be simply an evolutionary spiritual process : and, in that case, what guarantee have we that it conveys to us any binding and essential truth? Perhaps it is my own defect that I have never been able to understand the 'non-institutional,' Quaker theory of the Inner Light.

Of course, in the case of the Roman Catholic Church, it is needful to distinguish between what is essential and what is not. Only in essential matters does that Church claim to be preserved from error. Without here going into arguments, I may say that my own difficulties have been dealt with on the basis of that distinction. Anyone, then, who has read my writings since I left the Roman Church in 1926, can rely (allowing, of course, for the liability, common to us all, to make unintentional slips) on their honest accuracy in statements of fact. What I withdraw are some inferences, or opinions. I may add that my eventual resolution to ask to be 'received back' was based on assurances—in regard to my difficulties about 'freedom' and 'intolerance'— on the accuracy of which I absolutely relied to make such resolution possible.

Finally, I have no 'grievances' against anyone whom I have met since leaving the Roman Catholic Church. I hope to keep their friendship, and perhaps still to be able to discuss with them the grave problems which we desire to solve.

Yours faithfully,

106 Gillespie Road, Highbury, London, N.5. J. W. POYNTER.
July 15th, 1933.

[We are glad to publish this letter of a sincere and religious man, though quite unable to agree with the step he has taken and his reasons for it.

We do not view the Christian religion as a definite doctrinal revelation, and we do not think that the Christian religion ever has possessed a Divine institution which has been protected from being mistaken. We view the Christian religion as the gift of the Spirit of Christ to the world. That

Spirit may be viewed in various aspects. It is pre-eminently a spirit of Divine Sonship unveiling the Divine Fatherhood. It is a Spirit of Divine Love, Truth, and Freedom. The Christian Church is not pre-eminently a corporation for the protection and propagation of a definite, doctrinal revelation, but a Spirit-bearing fellowship. It is not, however, the Corporation which is the *organon* of the Divine Inspiration, but in his measure each individual who is a member of that Corporation—particularly its prophets and saints. The test of the Presence and Power of this Spirit of Christ is of course manifest in the character and activities of the Corporation as a whole, but it is much more strikingly manifest in the character and conduct of individuals who compose it. It is the undue stressing of the Corporation which has been the frequent source of ecclesiastical despotism and tyranny and has led the Corporation not only to sin grievously against Christian love and freedom but also against Christian truth. It is this aspect of the Papacy which is painfully apparent to the student of Church history. By its authorized schemes of Discipline, Doctrine and Worship, the Roman Church presents grave obstructions to the advance of Christian freedom, truth and love among mankind.

What we English Modernists hope is that just as the Roman Church did much to reform itself as the result of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, so it will do much to reform itself again as the result of the Modernist Reformation, by no means fully accomplished, of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Perhaps when that is achieved we may have the longed-for Reunion of Christendom.—Ed., *M.C.*]

THE TEACHING OF RELIGION IN SCHOOLS.

Mr. Jeffreys' paper at the last Modern Churchman's Conference, and the discussion which followed, drew attention again to the need, widely felt by schoolmasters and mistresses in all types of schools, for better training of teachers in the giving of religious instruction. Mr. Champion, of the Latymer School, asked that Ripon Hall might afford facilities for teachers to proceed further in their religious studies and in the exploration of teaching methods in this subject. Others since have made the same request and offered certain suggestions. I would like here to repeat what I ventured to say at the Conference. So far as Ripon Hall has opportunity to assist teachers in this matter, I should be very glad to see it done.

It would be of great help to me if interested teachers would indicate how best the Hall can help them: whether by offering accommodation and instruction for a special course in the Hall for teachers, if sufficient should desire it, or by attempting to find room during the Long Vacation Term (beginning about the middle of July) for a few teachers anxious to pursue a holiday course, or by any other means. It would be of help also if teachers would say what subjects such courses might most profitably include and at how elementary or advanced a standard the study of these subjects should aim. Letters may be written to me either privately or for publication in these columns.

The religious instruction of children and adolescents is one of the important and most difficult tasks the Church has before it to-day. We are anxious that Ripon Hall should do what it can to assist and I am grateful to those teachers who already, in asking the Hall to help, have made useful suggestions which are receiving careful consideration.

H. D. A. Major,
Principal.

Ripon Hall.
Boars Hill, Oxford.

CARDINAL NEWMAN.

SIR,

I have read the two letters of 'E.B.' in the June and July number of the *Modern Churchman,* and I should be glad if I may have the opportunity of giving my recollections of Cardinal Newman, who was my great-uncle, whom I knew as a child, and whom my mother knew well. I had also in recent times in my possession a considerable number of unpublished letters from him to his mother and sisters up to 1831, which included his undergraduate days and a period beyond, and also letters of a much later date, written by him to his sister Jemima (my grandmother) even after he became Cardinal. Nothing emerges more clearly from these letters than his completely normal domestic affections. He was intensely attached to his family. After his father's death he became the natural protector of his mother and sisters, as the eldest son. Plans for their comfort filled his mind. He arranged their journeys for them, supervised all arrangements when they were about to stay in a new house, and advised them down to the last detail. If ever any man had the feeling of affection and personal care for his family Newman had. His sense of responsibility extended itself to the general overlooking of his younger brother Francis at Oxford, and this may have been partly the cause of the irritation which existed in the relations of the two brothers to each other in later life. Whatever the Cardinal's temperamental shortcomings may have been, they were not those of indifference to human or domestic affections. The death of his young sister Mary nearly broke his heart at the time, and he never completely recovered his youthful gaiety and light-heartedness.

His interest in his own family remained till the day of his death and was always practical. There is a letter written so late as 1848 to my grandmother imploring her not to delay the baptism of her little boy, and later on another letter recommending suitable medicines for some slight ailment. I can remember his extreme pleasure when my brother, quite a child, sent him a Christmas card, and how he promptly responded with another most beautiful one and a letter. This was when he was an old man and a Cardinal. And so well did he consider his relations (all of them Anglicans) that in his will he expressed a wish for any of the younger generation, then just growing up, to attend his funeral if they desired, all their expenses of travelling to be met out of his estate.

Now, sir, is this compatible with what 'E.B.' calls (technically, I know) 'inhumanity and without affection'? The fact is that when a man receives a strong spiritual call he must follow it as the first disciples did, but that does not mean that there is no sacrifice, though the sacrifice may not be fully realised, nor does it mean that the fundamental humanity is extinguished. We can see this plainly in the great Apostle St. Paul, whose affectionate nature shines out so wonderfully in his epistles, and whose personal care for others, even in small details, never failed him. Yet he did not hesitate for a moment to lay aside all earthly ties when he felt the call of God, and nobody would dare to describe him or the Twelve as homosexual or 'without affection.' I could ask on what evidence of any conceivable kind is this theory of Cardinal Newman based? It seems to be a pure assumption. But I do not wish to fill up your space. The object of this letter is not so much to convince 'E.B.' as to try to show to your readers that the Cardinal had a warm-hearted and naturally domestic character, and might, if he had not felt a vocation to devote his life to the service of God and the Church (first the Church of England and later on the Catholic Church), have had a life of ordinary human interests and home content.

I am convinced that Cardinal Newman's conversion was, humanly speaking, mainly intellectual, and in no way either emotional or sentimental.

There is evidence that he was not for a long while really at his ease in his new surroundings. But over and above this it was a spiritual vocation.

As the eldest of his surviving near relations and almost the only one living who can really remember him personally, I do ask you in common justice to allow this letter to appear in your journal.

Yours faithfully,

Merivale, Headingley, Leeds. ELEANOR SPILMONT.

August 9th, 1933.

SIR,

Many of the readers of the *Modern Churchman* must be astonished at the space allowed to an anonymous correspondent, who affronts them with suggesting that (1) they mispronounce the word *homo*; (2) they believe this word to be one parent of the monstrous mongrel 'homosexual'; (3) they swallow whole the nonsense, as well as the jargon, of Freudian psychology.

Yours obediently,

Hurstbourne Tarrant, Andover, Hants. ARTHUR F. HORT.

July 24th, 1933.

SIR,

I accused 'E.B.' of being somewhat cowardly for attacking a dead man by applying to him a word whose best-known meaning is an infamous one. In reply he offers:

(*a*) A ponderous disquisition on the difference between 'homo' and 'homos,' of which educated people are perfectly well aware; (*b*) remarks on roots of words; (*c*) denunciation of Newman for his 'apostasy'; (*d*) an opinion that Newman wrote mediocre prose (!); (*e*) a pot-pourri of medical and (*soi-disant*) psychological information.

'E.B.' then tells your readers that professional reasons prevent his publishing his name.

'E.B.'s red herrings do not interest me, but I am not surprised that a person who makes a suggestive and anonymous attack on a dead man is afraid lest his professional colleagues should know he has done so.

My accusation of cowardice is clearly not without foundation. 'E.B.' is not afraid lest those who honour Newman should suffer. He evidently *is* afraid lest he himself should be known to be — in Newman's phrase — the poisoner of the wells.

E. N. MOZLEY.

July 20th, 1933.

SIR,

Colonel Mozley has written one of those letters which answer themselves, and I will not commit the unkindness of adding any comment of my own. But, since I ventured to ask your readers to consider the motives of Newman and of his Romanising followers to-day in the light of modern psychological knowledge, a book has appeared in which this is done, *Oxford Apostles*, by Geoffrey Faber (Faber and Co.); and to this I would draw the attention of the large body of thoughtful people who read the *Modern Churchman*. It is a pity that Hutton's articles in the *Expositor* have not been reprinted in book form, since few people will take the trouble to look up magazine files; but Mr. Faber's book will help many to understand the importance of neurosis in the realm of intellect.

E.B.

[This correspondence must now close. We regret deeply the pain it has given to Cardinal Newman's relations, of whose existence we were not conscious when we published the letter. We may add that we do not for one moment believe that Newman was homosexual in the sense in which Lt.-Col. Mozley understands that term.—ED., *M.C.*]